THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXIV, No. 1 JANUARY, 1956

CONTENTS

Thanksgiving ..... *Archbishop Cicognani* 1

Our Oldest Church of Mary Immaculate
Marion A. Habig, O.F.M. 5

The Ecclesiastical Orders of Knighthood. Part IV
James Van der Veldt, O.F.M. 10

Appraisal in Sacred Theology ..... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 24

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Interpretation of the Eucharistic Fast Concessions 37

The Ablutions at a Morning Mass 38

Advantages from an Earlier System of Time 39

Black Antependium 41

Repeated Benedictions 41

Bedroom over Altar 41

Vespers followed by Benediction 42

Newly Ordained and Indulgences 42

Group Dispensations for the Eucharistic Fast 43

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1956 by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Leonine Prayer Intention 43
Renewal of Sacred Species 44

ANALECTA

Summary of Recent Roman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 45
The Holy Father's Address on Highway Safety 47
The Decree and Instruction by the Sacred Congregation of Rites on the Renewal of the Holy Week Ordo 51

BOOK REVIEWS

The Psalms: Fides Translation 63
John Carroll of Baltimore. *By Annabelle M. Melville* 64
The Scholar and the Cross: The Life and Work of Edith Stein. *By Hilda C. Graef* 66
Patristic Homilies on the Gospels. Vol. I. *Translated and edited by M. F. Toal* 67
Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma. *By Ludwig Ott* 69

SERIES OF 6 MEDALLIONS

Each 18″ x 18″

Authentically hand detailed in full color stained glass effect.

Birth of the Virgin, Nativity, Ave Maria, Education, Flight to Egypt, & Coronation.

per copy $12.50
Entire set of 6 medallions only $54.

Simulate STAINED GLASS WITH LITHOPHANE

Now any smooth glass can be transformed into edifying church-like windows. Appropriate stock patterns that are easy, quick to do and inexpensive. In world wide use by Churches; Schools, Chapels, Hospitals, etc.

Illustrated (hand detailed in full color) Adoring Angel No. 1250 at left; Adoring Angel No. 1260 at right; Our Lady No. 1280, center. 10½″ x 42″—$15.00 ea. 17½″ x 72″—$19.50 ea.

Geometric Multicolored basic Lithophane for filler and border, 37 sq. ft. 18½″ x 25″, No. 1209 . . . . . $12.50.

CONFESSIONAL Booth Drape
Heavy wine red VELOUR. Tailored with shirred or loop tops and chain weighted hems. Beautiful and durable. Reg. $35.00 Special **$22.75**
(*Send sizes, we custom cut free*)
Embroid. Symbol—$5.00 extra

Easily adapted to larger or smaller windows. (Send window sizes for free layout catalog and samples.)

IVALCO DEPT. A-1. 5206 TILDEN AVE. BROOKLYN 3, N. Y.

THANKSGIVING[1]

"Quid retribuam?". . . Every day with these words and with a feeling of a certain bewilderment we offer thanks to God for the celebration of the Mass, the holy, divine adventure that Our Lord has bequeathed to us priests that we may continue with Him His work of redemption. Yet, on this my anniversary of a personal jubilee I would have liked to fulfill the duty of thanksgiving, as usual, in silence and not to inconvenience anyone. But I understand that a total of fifty years of priesthood is like a conspicuous climax that cannot be hidden.

The Lord in His mercy and goodness has allowed me to renew His redemptive action thousands and thousands of times, more than eighteen thousand Masses; an action always new and cherished and sublime. Certainly, for me alone to thank God for so great and inestimable a privilege would have been inadequate. Therefore, I am profoundly grateful to you, Your Eminences and Your Excellencies, the Most Reverend Archbishops and Bishops, for having with fraternal charity invited me to fulfill this task with a Pontifical Mass in the devotional Chapel of Trinity College, highly honored by your presence and by the assistance of a good number of priests, of Their Excellencies, the Ambassadors of the Diplomatic Corps and of distinguished members of the laity. With you, who not only represent but are the Church ("Ubi Episcopus, ibi Ecclesia"), and with the others who participated with you, I feel that this rendering of thanks is acceptable to God, and I express sincere, abiding gratitude.

* * * * *

I offer humble and fervent thanks to the Lord for having called me to the priesthood. I have passed the years of my priesthood

[1]This is the text of Archbishop Cicognani's address, delivered at the banquet in honor of the fiftieth anniversary of his priestly ordination, given by the Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops, of the United States at Trinity College, Washington, D. C., on November 17, last. The Apostolic Delegate himself was the celebrant at an evening Mass. His Eminence Cardinal Mooney preached at the Mass, and His Eminence Cardinal Stritch spoke for the American hierarchy at the dinner. His Excellency Archbishop Alter acted as toastmaster.

in the service of the Holy See in two places, Rome and Washington.

With commotion of soul I recall in these circumstance the fond remembrance of the Superiors I had in the Eternal City, illustrious Prelates and Cardinals of venerable memory; there I assisted from close by at the glorious and holy acts of the last Supreme Pontiffs; I saw and treated with innumerable priests, bishops and people, I may say, from the West and from the East. Truly I feel lost in trying to render to God the gratitude I owe for His having accorded me, the least among His priests, the privilege of having part, although small and that of a humble servant, in the marvelous work of the Holy See at the center of Christianity.

Transferred to this country, I saw wonderful events and magnificent things, in time of peace and in time of war; I refer to the ecclesiastical field. I would not even be able to indicate however briefly all those things so I limit myself to one that is connected with the priesthood, not with mine but with the priesthood in America. Here I have seen every day unfold as a spectacle or panorama of genuine greatness and of astonishing activity and efficiency; everywhere it begins at dawn with the Holy Mass and continues until late evening, usually closing with instructions on the faith in the parish rectories. Under the action of the Holy Spirit which spreads charity, Christian life pulsates strong and flourishing, it may be said, in all churches, schools and institutions, religious houses and seminaries, in the Catholic Charities and Mission Centers, local and national, in the multiple and varied camps of the apostolate, in your chanceries, always ready to provide for the needs of the faithful; and I wish to mention that chancery which belongs to all of you, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, a strong bond of your mutual solidarity and of your devotion to the Holy See. In all of this vibrant work the priests stand at your side, devout and zealous, and your and their charity expands and broadens itself for the edification even of the entire world. "God gives the growth" (*I Cor.* 3:7). You, the Most Reverend Archbishops and Bishops, columns in the living temple of the Church, direct and promote, always "vigilantes in gratiarum actione" (*Col.* 4:2).

Thanksgiving is the Eucharist, and to it do I refer; thanks to your pastoral solicitude and the co-operation of the priests, devotion to the Eucharist has been enlarged and stabilized to a point of

glorification in this country; and I am convinced that this is the principal reason for the outstanding success of the Church. Wisely, you have favored in every way, and at the cost of not light sacrifices, ecclesiastical vocations, and the power of the living God became evident and extraordinarily manifest: new and well-equipped seminaries, staffs of the best directors and faculties of exemplary and well-prepared teachers. In this way was doubled the number of the "adjutores Dei" for the salvation of souls, and the beautiful panorama of the altars and of the holy tabernacle was extended to every corner of America. Everywhere you can see churches and chapels and the Mass is now celebrated even in the most remote places. From these numerous altars descend daily the apostles of the Lord to go, ambassadors of Christ, to spend the day in zealous work productive of a rich harvest. This is the spectacle that the Church in the United States of America presents; as spectator and witness I have followed it with joy and with admiration. The Lord uses the priesthood for the spiritual progress of souls and of peoples; and America, I repeat, gives a bright example of this, while your intimate, generous co-operation with the Holy Father and his desires and programs constitute a page—or rather a volume—of glory for this Episcopate.

For about one-half of my priesthood I have been here with you and your priests and we have celebrated the "Sacrum Convivium," so to speak, at the same table. We have, therefore, prayed together daily for the Church and for our Supreme Pontiff, Pius. From the Vicar of Christ and in him bishops and priests attain power and unity. We have prayed together for the clergy and all those who are consecrated to the service of God that in the fulfillment of their duties, in Christ, "per ipsum, et cum ipso, et in ipso," they may be able to increase always more the glory of God through the salvation of men. We have prayed daily for your dioceses, for America and, allow me to say, for our beloved America. Strong and full then, may my thanksgiving, offered in union with you, ascend to God.

* * * * *

And now infinite thanks for this cordial manifestation; it is a token of affection in my regard; it is an homage of devotion to the Supreme Pontiff; it is an attestation of faith in the priest-

hood. Thanks to those who initiated and organized this celebration; special thanks to the Administrative Board of the Conference and to His Excellency the Most Reverend Archbishop O'Boyle who had a good part of the burden of the preparation; warmest thanks to Their Eminences, Cardinal Mooney and Cardinal Stritch, and His Excellency, Archbishop Alter, for their generous expressions —too generous—of appreciation; and thanks again to Your Eminences and Your Excellencies for your presence here today, an honor far beyond my deserts or merits; and fond thanks to the members of the Diplomatic Corps, to our beloved priests, to the seminarians who served at the altar and sang so well, and to all here present.

✠A. G. Cicognani
Archbishop of Laodicea
Apostolic Delegate to the United States

OUR OLDEST CHURCH OF MARY IMMACULATE

One hundred and ninety-four years ago, in the year 1762, there was great rejoicing at La Purísima Concepción Mission, two and a half miles south of San Antonio's Alamo (which was then Mission San Antonio de Valero). The new and beautiful church of Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción, after having been building for some two decades, had finally been completed. It was built of dressed blocks of stone and good mortar; and it had a dome and two towers, with bells. The length of the church was 89 feet, and its width 22 feet.

The adjoining friary, with its pleasing archway along one side, was the home of two Franciscan missionaries, Father Guadalupe de Prado and Father Pedro de Parras. Next to it stood a large hall, where woolen and cotton cloth and blankets were woven by the looms of the mission. There was also a separate granary building in which 1,600 bushels of corn and 100 bushels of beans were stored. Likewise, a blacksmith shop, and a carpenter shop with cabinet-making tools. Also, masonry and stone-work tools.

On both sides of the mission church and friary were rows of stone houses, the homes of fifty-eight Indian families, comprising 207 persons. The mission village, with its church and shops and homes, was protected by a rectangular stone wall.

Outside the village was a fenced farm, watered by an irrigation ditch which led the water from a stone dam at the river, through the middle of the village, to the cultivated fields. In the stables were forty-five yokes of oxen for work in the fields. And in those fields were growing corn, beans, melons, watermelons, pumpkins, and sweet potatoes. There was also a mission ranch, having 610 head of cattle, 2,200 sheep and goats, 200 mares, and 120 horses; also several houses for the Indian cowboys and shepherds.

La Purísima Concepción was indeed a flourishing mission in 1762. At the end of that century, following the secularization decree, it gradually ceased to exist. Today the mission is no more, but its church, completed in 1762, still stands—the oldest church of the Immaculate Conception in the United States.

Originally the Texas mission of La Purísima Concepción was founded in 1716 at a different place in the eastern part of the state,

in the chief village of the Ainay or Hainai Indians. It was the second mission established in eastern Texas, and was situated about twenty-two miles northeast of Nacogdoches, or, to indicate the location more exactly, not far from present Linwood Crossing, near two springs, a mile or two east of the place where the highway crosses the Angelina River. Its first missionary was Father Gabriel Vérgara; and he was still there in 1729, when he held the office of Presidente of all the Texas missions, which were staffed by Franciscans from the Apostolic College of Querétaro.

Because of the proximity of the French and the abolition of the Spanish presidio of Dolores, it was decided to move La Purísima Concepción and two other east Texas missions, namely San Francisco de los Neches and San José de los Nazonis, to the Colorado River. By July 27, 1730, they were temporarily established on the Colorado; but the site proved to be unsatisfactory, and another transfer followed. The places chosen for the three missions lay along the San Antonio River at easy distance from one another, and not far from Mission San Antonio de Valero, established there in 1718, and Mission San José de Aguayo, founded in 1720. The Apaches were a menace in this area, but this difficulty was not regarded as insuperable.

The transfer of the missions was no small achievement in that day and region. It really meant the establishment of new missions with the movable property of the old. The Indian neophytes of the missions in East Texas did not go along, and were henceforth taken care of spiritually from Mission Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe at Nacogdoches. Other Indians belonging to the Pacaos, Pajalat, and Alobja (Pitalaques) tribes had to be induced to settle down there; and this was no easy task since these Indians like most of those in Texas had nomadic habits. For this purpose the missionaries had to make two trips to distant places in the Indian country. It was Padre Presidente Vérgara himself who, with his fellow-missionaries, finally succeeded in gathering about one thousand Indians in the three new missions.

The moving of the property of the missions, the furnishings of the churches, the herds of cattle, horses, mules and burros, across the plains of Texas for a distance of 375 miles and across several large rivers, was indeed a remarkable feat. At the new sites, fields had to be plowed; irrigation ditches had to be built; provisions

for feeding a thousand Indians had to be transported from the Rio Grande; shelters had to be erected for storing the provisions and supplies; temporary structures of rough timber, plastered with clay and roofed with grass, had to be built as chapels and quarters for the missionaries. And yet, all this had been accomplished by May 4, 1731, at no extra expense to the government.

La Purísima Concepción retained its name, with the addition of "de Acuña"; San Francisco de los Neches (or Tejas) was henceforth called San Francisco de la Espada; and San José de los Nazonis became San Juan Capistrano, since there was a San José Mission already on the San Antonio River. The latter was in charge of Fathers from the Apostolic College of Zacatecas, while the others, including San Antonio de Valero, were missions of the Querétaro College.

In 1739 a virulent epidemic of smallpox and measles swept through the five missions on the Rio San Antonio; and many of the Indians fled to the woods and abandoned the missions. La Purisima Concepción, which before the epidemic had 290 Indians, had only 120 left. Father Ignacio Ysasmendi, who had been falsely accused by former Governor Franquis of being cruel to the Indians, died during the epidemic, a martyr of charity.

However, by the close of 1740 the mission village of La Purísima Concepción again had a population of 210. A report from that year tells us that the mission buildings were still temporary, and the church had a thatched roof of straw.

It must have been shortly after that report was made that the missionaries began to construct the present church of stone which they found in a quarry nearby. By 1745 it was half completed. While the new church was being built, divine services were held in a large adobe hall, which had a separate room for a sacristy. In this temporary church there was a good altar with a carved image of Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception.

At this time, in 1745, there was already a two-story stone house for the two missionaries, two private rooms upstairs and two offices downstairs; also three stone houses for soldiers who were assigned to this mission as guards; also three stone houses for a large stone granary. The entire mission compound and village was even then surrounded by a stone wall.

After the stone church of La Purísima Concepción had been completed in 1762, the missionaries were able to enjoy the fruits of their work for only some three decades longer. On April 10, 1794, all the missions of Texas existing over ten years, except two at La Bahia, were ordered "secularized"; and the powers which the disinterested missionaries had exercised over the natives for their benefit were now transferred to new administrative officers who were primarily interested in promoting their own advantage.

During the preceding decade the number of Indians living at La Purísima Concepción had grown less and less, so that when Father José Maria Camarena was ordered to turn over the property of this mission to the local Indians there were only 38 persons left, 16 men and 15 women and 7 children. Four missionaries remained to instruct the Indians who had recently been admitted to the missions on the San Antonio River.

In 1809 there were still two missionaries for four missions, one of them La Purísima Concepción. The stone church of the latter was still in fair condition, but there were only 21 Indians left, 9 men and 12 women. Of the mission lands only a small portion, about fifteen square leagues, had been distributed among the Indians; and 32 Spaniards, 18 men and 14 women, who had rented mission lands, were living at the mission.

The church of Mission La Purísima Concepción was repaired in 1850, and rededicated to Nuestra Señora de Lourdes; and, of course, Our Lady of Lourdes is the Immaculate Conception. Since then, the stone church has been kept in repair, so that today it is still the church which was built in the middle of the eighteenth century and completed in 1762—the oldest church of the Immaculate Conception in the United States.

There is another mission church of the Immaculate Conception in Texas—Nuestra Señora de la Concepción del Socorro. It became quite well known at the time of the Dallas Centennial Exposition; for a replica of this mission was one of the exhibits there. This mission was founded before La Purísima Concepción de Acuña, but the present adobe church at Socorro was constructed only in 1844.

Socorro is situated on U. S. Highway 80, sixteen miles east of El Paso, Texas. It was established originally in 1682 by Governor

Don Antonio Otermín of New Mexico and Father Francisco de Ayeta, O.F.M., for Piro, Jemez, and other New Mexican Indians. No less than fourteen Indian pueblos and missions were founded in the El Paso district, especially during the years following the Great Rebellion of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico in 1680.

There had been a Socorro Mission on the Rio Grande, farther north in New Mexico, which was founded by Father García, one of the thirty new missionaries who went with Father Perea to New Mexico in 1628-1629. Father García is credited with planting the first vineyard in New Mexico at the earlier Socorro Mission, which had ceased to exist by 1680.

The first church erected at Socorro, Texas, in 1682 was very probably a log building. In 1690 an adobe church was built at this mission and remained standing for more than two centuries until 1829, when it was washed away by the river. It was rebuilt of adobe bricks in 1844; and that church, now over a hundred years old, is the one at Socorro today.

Like the earlier mission of Socorro in New Mexico, the Pueblo de la Purísima Concepción del Sorocco near El Paso was known for its grapes. In fact, the grapes of the latter were regarded in 1766 as the equal of those in Spain. They made good wine and even better brandy; and sometimes the village did not raise enough corn.

Though founded before the Immaculate Conception Mission near San Antonio, that of Socorro was not, as has been erroneously claimed, the first mission in the United States with a church dedicated to the Immaculate Conception. That distinction belongs to two missions of La Purísima Concepción in New Mexico, one at Hawikuh near Zuñi and the other at Quarai near Mountainair, both of which were founded in 1629.

MARION A. HABIG, O.F.M.

Franciscan Library
St. Louis, Missouri

THE ECCLESIASTICAL ORDERS OF KNIGHTHOOD

Part IV

PONTIFICAL ORDERS OF KNIGHTHOOD

The Pontifical Orders of Knighthood, in contrast with the other ecclesiastical orders heretofore mentioned, are directly dependent on the Pope and membership in them is bestowed by the Holy See. They are, in decreasing order of rank, the Order of Christ, the Order of the Golden Spur, the Order of Pius, the Order of Saint Gregory the Great, and the Order of Saint Sylvester, Pope.

That of the Order of Christ can with certainty trace its origin back to the age of chivalry; and in all probability that of the Golden Spur. The last three, in their present status, are of more recent date, the Order of Pius and of St. Gregory being founded in the last century, whereas the present order of St. Sylvester was established in the beginning of this century.

All of them are secular orders of merit, even though the ritual of investiture followed by the Order of Christ contains some elements that are reminiscent of the ancient religious order from which it descends.

All matters concerning the bestowal, registration, legislation and description of emblems, badges and uniforms of the pontifical orders are handled by the chancery of the orders of knighthood which functions under the "Secretaria a Brevibus Apostolicis Literis," a section of the Papal Secretariate of State.

The very exclusive Orders of Christ and of the Golden Spur have only one degree, that of knights. The other three, at present, consist of three degrees or classes of which the second class is subdivided: (1) Grand Cross Knights; (2) Commanders with plaque and Commanders; (3) Knights. The first wear the cross of the respective order hanging from the grand cordon, that is to say a large ribbon in the colors of the respective orders passing from the right shoulder over the breast to the left side of the body. Besides, the members of this class are entitled to the *plaque,* an ornamental brooch in the form of a radiating star surrounding the emblem of the order to be worn on the

chest. The knights commanders wear the cross of the order on a ribbon around the neck; the first degree commanders are entitled to a *plaque* of minor dimensions; those of the second degree do not enjoy this privilege. The class of the knights wear the cross on a small ribbon pinned on the left chest of the uniform or suit.

To the question why the Papacy bestows these decorations, the answer is given by a Pope who certainly disapproved of any vanity or show but who nevertheless recognized the value of such decorations, namely St. Pius X. In the preamble to the Brief *Multum ad excitandos* (Feb. 7, 1905)[1] in which he reorganized the Orders of Christ, of the Golden Spur and of St. Sylvester, the holy pontiff makes this statement: "Multum ad excitandos ad egregia facinora hominum animos, praemia virtuti reddita valent, quae dum ornant egregios bene de re sacra vel publica meritos viros, ceteros exemplo rapiunt ad idem laudis honorisque spatium decurrendum." And his predecessor, Pius IX, in the Brief *Romanis Pontificibus* (June 17, 1847),[2] declared that orders of knighthood "are not instituted to encourage vanity and ambition, but solely to reward virtue and outstanding merits."[3]

THE SUPREME ORDER OF CHRIST
MILITIA DOMINI NOSTRI JESU CHRISTI

Saint Pius X in his Brief *Multum ad excitandos,* mentioned above, decreed that the Supreme Order of Christ is to be considered the highest ranking of all Pontifical Orders. It looks almost like an ironical twist of history when we recall that the highest decoration granted by the Pope at the present day proves to derive from a religious order which one of the Pope's predecessors suppressed in the fourteenth century.

The Order of Christ was founded in the year 1318, but since it is a continuation—under a different name—of the Order of the Templars, it goes as far back as 1119. In all probability this makes the Order of Christ the oldest order of knighthood in the

[1] *A.S.S.,* XXXVII (1904-1905), 565-71.

[2] *Pii P.M. IX Acta,* I, 1, (Rome, 1854), 43-45.

[3] F. Guigue de Champvans de Farémont, *Histoire et législation des ordres de chevalerie, marques d'honneur et médailles du Saint-Siège* (Paris, 1932); M. Gorino, *Causa, titoli nobiliari e Ordini equestri pontifici* (Turin, 1933); S. Felice y Quadremy, *Ordenes de Caballeria Pontificias* (Mallorca, 1950).

world. We say, in all probability, for there is quite a controversy about the prior antiquity of the Order of the Temple or that of the Hospital. The most likely answer seems to be that the Order of the Hospital antedates the former by a few years, inasmuch as the Hospitallers were organized in the year 1112. However, at first they were an order of charity and only gradually did they develop into a military order during the reign of the second master, Raymond du Puy (1120-60), whereas the Templars were organized from the outset as a military order. For that reason the Temple can be said to be the prototype of all orders of knighthood.

Although the leaders of the first Crusade had defeated the infidels in the Holy Land and captured Jerusalem, July 15, 1099, still many bands of Saracens were left which held several mountain strongholds and were roving around the countryside, harassing the Christian pilgrims on their way to the holy places. In view of this state of affairs, Hugh de Payns, a knight from Champagne, in 1119, twenty years after the capture of Jerusalem, gathered around him in that city seven companions and formed with these knights a religious community. In contrast with the ordinary religious groups, this community had a special character, for the knights not only took the usual vows of obedience, poverty and chastity, but they added a fourth vow of a decidedly military nature. In virtue of this vow the knights became a kind of transport troops, providing the Christian pilgrims with police escort. Later, the vow assumed a more general character, namely that of defending the Holy Land. The knights called themselves *Milites Christi,* soldiers of Christ, but because their first Convent was a part of the palace of the king of Jerusalem, which was supposed to have been built close by the place where once Solomon's temple stood, they became traditionally known as the Knights of the Temple, or the Templars.

In the first few years of their existence, they followed the Augustinian rule, but later adopted a rule written for them by St. Bernard of Clairvaux, the great promoter of the second crusade and admirer of the Templar's ideal. This rule was based on the rule of the Cistercians but adapted to the way of life of the knights. Because of this connection with St. Bernard's order, the knights wore over their armature a white mantle to which Pope Eugenius III added a red cross. The members of the Temple

were divided into three classes: the knights, the sergeants-at-arms and priests who acted as chaplains for the order.

In the space allotted it is not possible to discuss in detail the development, the activities and the decline of the Templars. They proved themselves real heroes in the battles against the enemies of the Cross, although at times they were imprudent and reckless, and needlessly sacrificed their men. Occasionally, they were in arms against their Christian brothers, especially the Hospitallers of St. John. They had the reputation of being proud, even to the point of arrogance. Great wealth they accumulated, but—unlike the Hospitallers—they were little engaged in works of charity and thus left themselves open to charges of selfishness and greed as launched against them by their enemies.

After the fall of Acre (1291) the Templars gave up the fight against the Crescent. The Knights of St. John kept on fighting at sea while the "Soldiers of Christ" (Knights Templar) retired to Western Europe, and became bankers as well as financial administrators of kings and merchants.

These financial enterprises—so different from the original objectives as envisaged by St. Bernard—did not last long. Twenty-one years after they had left the Orient, the Templars were suppressed on April 3, 1312, by Pope Clement V who acted under pressure from the French king Philip the Fair. The merits of the trial in which the charges against the Templars were weighed is still a matter of debate among historians, the majority of whom, however, believe that these charges were false in general. There is the curious note that the Pope in his formula of suppression stated that the act of exstinction was not to be taken as a condemnation of the Templars; also, that Philip the Fair had the last Grand Master, Jacques de Molay, burned at the stake (March 18, 1314), before the three cardinals whom the Pope had ordered to investigate his case had a chance to bring the trial to an end. It is true, nonetheless, that the Order of the Templars outlived its usefulness for the Church—except in Portugal and Spain.[4]

That exception was to have far-flung consequences. The Templars in Portugal and Spain had not become mere bankers, but still lived up to the purpose for which they were founded, namely

[4] Cf. G. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon,* 9th ed. (Paris, 1950), pp. 562-65.

the fight against the infidel. Hence, King Denis I of Portugal —husband of St. Elizabeth—and James II of Aragon were quite satisfied with the services of the Templars in their countries and refused to believe the charges of idolatry and heresy brought against them. They therefore failed to obey the directives of the papal decree of suppression. Of course, they could not possibly allow the Templars to continue under their old name, for such a flagrant act of disobedience might well have merited excommunication. In their countries, they allowed the Templars to reorganize as a new military order of knighthood. Thus the Order of Christ came into existence in Portugal (1318) and the Order of Our Lady of Monteza in Spain; the latter was used for the defense of the coastal areas against the Saracens.[5]

One year after King Denis had established the Order of Christ and had assigned them the defense of Algarvia, a portion of his kingdom then threatened by the Moors, the Pope gave his blessing to the "new" institution. John XXII, successor of Clement V, in the Constitution *Ad ea, e quibus* of March 14, 1319[6] gave the approbation, stipulating that the Knights of Christ should assume the rule of the Cistercians—as the Templars had done—but, in addition, should follow some of the customs then in vogue in the Order of Calatrava. Besides, the Pope gave them all the properties of "the erstwhile Order of the Temple" (*Ordo quondam Templi*).

The vicissitudes of the Order of Christ in Portugal do not concern us here. Suffice it to say that they followed the usual pattern. The knights assisted the kings in their fight against the Moors, had their inevitable quarrels about jurisdictions and possessions and lost their religious character before the close of the 15th century. In 1499 Alexander VI freed them from their solemn vows and allowed them to marry. Eventually, the Order of Christ, like the other military orders in Portugal, became an order of merit. When the Republic was proclaimed in 1910, the order was abolished, but was re-established in 1918, with the President of the Republic assuming the office of grand master.

[5] According to a tradition among Free Masons, a number of French Templars went into hiding and formed a lodge of masonry.

[6] *Bullarium Romanum,* IV (Rome, 1644), 277-84.

Of more importance is that the Order of Christ entered into an intimate relationship with the papacy. When John XXII approved the Order of Christ, he did so with the proviso that the Holy See had the right to appoint knights of that order. This regulation has been interpreted in a two-fold way. Some historians hold that there was originally only one order of which the Pope was the real head and that the kings of Portugal were his hereditary lieutenants in that kingdom. Others, however, believe that ever since 1319 there were two distinct Orders of Christ, one Portuguese and one Pontifical. The fact is that the Popes, since the time of John XXII, have conferred the knighthood of Christ. Besides, the Popes introduced a new element in the concept of knighthood. Instead of creating the knights by the usual ceremony of dubbing, the Pope appointed them by "letters patent," that is to say by issuing a decree whereby he conferred the rights and privileges of the knighthood upon those he designated. The purpose of the papal Order of Christ was the defense of the interests of the Holy See. It was throughout most of its history quite exclusive.

Pope St. Pius X in the Brief *Multum ad excitandos* decreed not only that the Order of Christ is the highest Pontifical order of knighthood but also specified with greater precision its insignia and the uniform of the members. The former consists in a red Latin cross surrounding a white cross and surmounted by a crown, pending from a double golden chain, an ornamental brooch, called the "plaque" or star and a sword. The uniform consists of a red tunic, white trousers and a white mantle.

The Pontifical Order of Christ consists of one class only: membership is reserved mostly to sovereigns and heads of state. In the year 1954 there were, according to the *Annuario Pontificio,* only five Knights of the Order of Christ in the world.

Although the Pontifical Order of Christ is an order of merit, its ancient religious origin is reflected in the fact that its members must be Catholic, and also in its ritual of investiture. After receiving the apostolic Brief of nomination (letters patent), the new knight presents himself with two witnesses before a cardinal of his choice or, if that is not possible, before the bishop of his diocese to whom he shows the Brief. He promises obedience to His Holiness the Pope and recites the profession of faith, where-

upon the presiding dignitary invests him with the collar of the order.

ORDER OF THE GOLDEN SPUR
MILITIA AURATA

In the Middle Ages, the spur was the symbol of knighthood, and in that sense all knights could be said to belong to the "Order of the Spur." When the Order of the Golden Spur was established is unknown. Pope St. Pius X in his Brief *Multum ad excitandos* maintains that it is among the oldest orders of knighthood and refers to the tradition which would have Pope St. Sylvester (314-35) the founder: "Neminem latet Ordinem Militiae auratae, sive ab aureo calcari, inter vetustissimos jure esse enumerandum: Constantino enim Magno Imperatore, Silvester PP. I sanctae memoriae decessor Noster, auctor illius fuisse dicitur." Be that as it may, the Pope expresses regret that in the course of time "the order has lost its ancient splendor and dignity because of human weaknesses and the vicissitudes of the times."

In the 16th century, for one thing, the right to confer this knighthood was no longer reserved to the Holy See. In 1539 Paul III Farnese (1534-49) granted high dignitaries of the papal court and the Roman princely families the privilege of conferring the Golden Spur. From that time on the order was so freely bestowed that it fell into disrepute.

To make matters worse, one of the Medici Popes, Pius IV (1559-65), decreed that membership of the Golden Spur entailed automatically the personal title of Roman Count for the titulary and hereditary nobility for his descendents. All this depreciated not only the distinctiveness of the Order of the Golden Spur but also of the Roman nobility.

Additional confusion was created when the Knights of the Golden Spur began to wear the coveted eight-pointed white cross of the Knights of the Order of Jerusalem. Pope Benedict XIV by a Brief of Sept. 7, 1747, abolished this abuse and ordered that the badge of the Order of the Golden Spur be an octagonal gilded cross with a small spur hanging from it.

At long last Pope Gregory XVI took the reformation of the Golden Spur in hand—a reformation which proved to be quite radical. In a Brief *Cum hominum mentes* of Oct. 31, 1841,[7] the

[7] *Acta Gregorii PP., XVI,* III (Rome, 1903), 178-80.

Pope practically suppressed the Order of the Golden Spur and established in its place the Order of St. Sylvester, presumably the founder of the old order. In remembrance of the latter, the Pope decreed that the accompanying title of the new order be *Militia Aurata.* The Pope reserved the right of conferring this new knighthood to the Holy See exclusively, revoking all delegated rights once given by his predecessors and abolished the privilege of conferring nobility. The membership of the order was reduced to 150 commanders and 300 knights and confined within the Papal States.

In 1905 another radical change occurred in the history of the Golden Spur. Pope St. Pius X by the Brief *Multum ad excitandos* separated the Order of the Golden Spur from that of St. Sylvester, making them two distinct orders from that time on.

In recognition of the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the restored *Militia Aurata* was put under the protection of the Immaculate Mother of Christ. Moreover, Pius ordered that the gilded cross of the order should in its centre carry a medal with a crowned monogram of Mary. This cross hangs from a trophy which in turn is attached to a red ribbon with white edgings to be worn around the neck. The knights also wear a plaque in the form of a silver star on which the same cross and medal are superimposed; their uniform is a red tunic and black trousers.

Pope Pius emphatically reiterated that membership does not entail personal nobility and still less hereditary nobility. The order comprises only one class, namely that of knights. The number of knights may not exceed 100, "lest the honor be decreased by too large a number," as the Brief states. Actually, in 1954, there were only ten Knights of the Golden Spur in the entire world. This knighthood is conferred upon men, "qui vel armis, vel scriptis, vel praeclaris operibus rem catholicam auxerint, et Ecclesiam Dei virtute tutarint, aut doctrina illustraverint." Membership is not limited to Catholics; the sentence just quoted leaves sufficient room for the candidacy of non-Catholics, inasmuch as they, too, may help the cause of Catholicism, as in signing a concordat with the Church or by giving freedom to the Catholic missions. In fact, four out of the ten existing knights are non-Catholics: one Greek Orthodox and three Mohammedans, among them the Shah of Iran.[8]

[8] *Annuario Pontificio* (1954), p. 998.

THE ORDER OF PIUS
ORDO PIANUS

The Order of Pius is the third in rank of the Pontifical Orders of Knighthood. It was erected by Pope Pius IX by the Brief *Romanis Pontificibus,* and was called after the founder, but also to honor the memory of Pius IV (1559-65) who in 1559 had instituted an Ordo Pianus. Since the latter had ceased to exist in the course of time, the order established by Pius IX could not be considered a continuation of it. However, the Pope stated specifically that he wished to "revive the ancient appellation introduced by his predecessor."

The order consisted of two degrees: knights of the first and knights of the second class. At the moment of nomination, they received title to personal nobility; in the case of the knights of the first class, the title was transmissible to their sons. The decoration of the order is an eight-pointed blue star surrounding a medal with the inscription "Pius IX" and "Virtuti et Merito"; the reverse bears the date of the foundation of the order, 1847. The decoration hangs from a blue ribbon with red edgings. The uniform is blue. The knights of the second degree were to wear the emblem on the left chest, those of the first degree had the privilege to wear it hanging from a blue ribbon around the neck. The latter could also wear a silver emblem similar to the badge but of larger dimensions on the left chest; only, however, after obtaining the special and expressed authorization of the Holy See.

Several of the stipulations made by Pius IX were changed within the next hundred years. One might speak of these changes as the story of the *minutiae* of an order of knighthood. In the first place there was the plaque. Two years after the founding of his order, Pius IX issued at Gaeta, in exile, the Brief *Cum hominum mentes* (June 17, 1849), wherein he ordered that from that date on all knights of the first class enjoyed the privilege of the emblem, but that a special permission of the Holy See was needed to wear a jewelled emblem. Moreover, knights of the first class should no longer wear the star of the order pendent from a collar around the neck, but from the grand cordon. This rule made them Knights of the Grand Cross.

By the Brief *In ipso* of Nov. 11, 1856, issued from the palace of the Quirinal, Pope Pius IX extended the number of degrees

to three: (1) Knights of the Grand Cross, wearing the grand cordon emblem; (2) Knights of the Second Class or Commanders, wearing the collar; (3) Knights of the Third Class, wearing the emblem on a small ribbon on the chest.

Pope Pius X in his Brief *Multum ad excitandos* reintroduced the famous emblem and instituted an intermediary degree by dividing the commanders into two classes: those with the emblem and those without.

Finally, Pope Pius XII in the Brief *Litteris suis* issued at St. Peter's, Nov. 11, 1939,[9] abolished the title to nobility of all knights to be nominated in the future. In giving the reason for this rule, the Pope reiterated the words of his predecessor, namely that the order was not instituted to encourage vanity and ambition, but only to reward personal merit.

ORDER OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT
ORDO GREGORIANUS

In the United States probably the best known of all the Pontifical Orders of Knighthood is the Order of St. Gregory, although it was originally instituted to honor the citizens of the erstwhile Papal States. When the energetic general of the Camaldulese became Pope under the name of Gregory XVI (1830-46), the Papal States were frequently troubled with political uprisings. In suppressing these rebellious movements, the Pope was aided not only by Austrian troops but also by many of his own faithful subjects.

To honor those who had distinguished themselves in the defense of the temporal power of the Holy See, Gregory erected an order of knighthood which he named after the first Pope who bore his own name, Saint Gregory I (590-604), and who is considered by several historians as the real founder of the temporal power of the Popes. However, the Brief *Quod summis quibusque,* issued at St. Mary Major (Sept. 1, 1831), whereby Gregory XVI erected this new pontifical order, does not restrict its membership explicitly to his own subjects, but extends it to those persons who have shown "incontrovertible loyalty to the Holy See," and to those who have distinguished themselves by their virtue and piety, by their social position, by the zeal evidenced

[9] *A.A.S.,* XXXII (1940), 41.

in fulfilling high office, or, in general, by the excellent reputation in which they are held.

The Pope decreed that the emblem of the order should be an eight-pointed red cross, having a little white medal in the center engraved with a picture of Saint Gregory the Great, the reverse of the medal carrying the motto *Pro Deo et Principe.* The cross hangs from a red ribbon with yellow borders, the colors of the order.

As originally instituted the order consisted of four degrees: (1) the Knights Grand Cross of the first class, who wore the cross on the grand cordon, and who were also entitled to wear a large cross in the form of a jewelled star on the chest; (2) Knights Grand Cross of the second class, who wore the same large ribbon but only a small single plaque on the left chest; (3) Knights Commanders whose cross hung from a ribbon around the neck; (4) Knights who wore the cross on the left chest.

In the Brief *Cum amplissimo honorum,* issued at St. Peter's, May 30, 1834, Pope Gregory reduced the order to three degrees. The two degrees of Knights Grand Cross were combined and the right to wear a jewelled emblem required special permission from the Holy See. This decree also specified the maximum number of Knights of St. Gregory for the residents of the Papal States. The Knights Grand Cross should be no more than 30, the Commanders no more than 70, the Knights no more than 300. However, the Pope reserved the right to nominate also persons residing outside the Pontifical States; the number of these nominees was unlimited.

There are two classes of Gregorian Knights, a civilian and military.[10] The difference is that the former wear the cross hanging from a green crown of laurel, whereas the latter have the cross hanging from a trophy. It is interesting to note that neither of the two documents issued by Gregory XVI says a word about a special uniform for the Knights of St. Gregory. The green uniform was later prescribed by Pope Pius IX.

THE ORDER OF SAINT SYLVESTER, POPE

This order—as we saw previously—was instituted by Pope Gregory XVI in 1841 to replace the Order of the Golden Spur,

[10] *Notificatio Cancellariae Ordinum Equestrium* (*A.S.S.*, XXXVII [1905]), 565.

but since the name of "Militia Aurata" was perpetuated, the order was spoken of as a combination of the two. In 1905 Pope St. Pius X "separated" the two orders and made the Order of Saint Sylvester the lowest ranking of the Pontifical Orders of Knighthood.

The order has three degrees, the second being subdivided into two classes: Knights of the Grand Cross; Knight Commanders with and without emblem; simple Knights. The emblem is an eight-pointed white cross with a medal of St. Sylvester in the center, the reverse side of the medal bearing the dates 1841-1905 in Roman figures to commemorate the order's founding by Gregory XVI and its renovation by St. Pius X. The emblem is a silver star with the cross of the order superimposed. The colors of the grand cordon, collar and ribbon on which the cross hangs, according to the different degrees, are three bands of red and two of black. The uniform of the order is black.

THE PAPAL DECORATIONS

The decorations bestowed by the Holy See at the present time are the Cross "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice" and the medal "Benemerenti." These decorations do not confer knighthood upon the recipient, but are medals of honor (*distintivi di onore*) given to both men and women who merit public token of gratitude from the Pope for their services. The conferring takes place by means of a diploma issued from the Secretariate of State.

Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice

Pope Leo XIII instituted this cross by the Apostolic Letter *Quod singulari Dei concessu* of July 17, 1888,[11] to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. Originally it was intended to reward those persons who had distinguished themselves in organizing the Vatican exposition in which were exhibited the gifts which Leo had received from every part of the world on the occasion of his golden jubilee. Later, the bestowal was extended to those who were eminent in their devotion toward the Church and the Papacy. The cross was initially issued in three degrees, gold, silver and bronze; Pope St. Pius X in 1908 decreed that the cross should come only in gold. The four arms of the cross are decorated with a comet and in between the

[11] *Acta Leonis XIII*, VIII (1889), 259.

arms are found four lilies: these embellishments are meant to recall the coat of arms of the Pecci family from which Leo derived. In the center of the cross is placed a medal bearing the bust of the founding Pope with the inscription "Leo XIII, P.M. Ann. X" (the tenth year of Leo's pontificate). The medal bears on the reverse side the tiara and the papal keys with the inscription "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice." On the reverse side of the arms of the cross are found these words "Prid. Cal. Ian. 1888." The cross hangs from a red, white, and yellow ribbon, to be worn on the left chest.

Benemerenti

This is the name of a series of medals issued by several Popes in order to reward distinguished services at special occasions. Pius VIII was the first to grant such a Benemerenti medal. The practice was continued by Gregory XVI in 1831 when he had a medal coined to reward those of his subjects who had shown themselves particularly faithful to the Pope during that troublesome year. Pope Pius IX did the same in gratitude to the soldiers who fought for him during the revolution of 1848 and 1849. St. Pius X, too, issued in 1910 a Benemerenti medal which was preferably granted for military services. A special medal is given to the Palatine guards after some years of faithful service. Pius XI created a Benemerenti medal to remunerate persons as well as groups who distinguished themselves in the organization of the Holy Year 1925 and of the missionary exhibition which was held in the Vatican in the same year.

Besides these special medals there is a Benemerenti medal of a more general character. It comes in gold, silver and bronze and it bears the effigy and the name of the reigning Pope, and on the reverse side a crown of laurel and the letter "B" ("Benemerenti"). The medal hangs from a yellow ribbon edged with white, to be worn on the left chest.

Hardly an institution in the world today has the equivalent of honors parallel to that of the Roman Catholic Church. In an age when initiative and ability tend to become lost in the overwhelming social changes that are so universal, these honors stand out as another instance of the timelessness of that Church. They salvage values and ideals from the past. Chivalry is more than romance; it is one of the graces of human dignity. Those who

would spurn the past cannot build the future. These honors are enshrined in a morality and code that is rooted in the love and charity of Christ made visible through human compassion and effort. They envision the kingdom of heaven as their perspective quite in the way of the parable Our Lord so earnestly preached when He tenderly uttered the words: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

JAMES VAN DER VELDT, O.F.M.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for January, 1906, contributed by Fr. H. Ganss, of Carlisle, Pa., is entitled "Luther's Table Talk." It gives an interesting account of the origin and the content of this published record of Luther's daily conversations. Fr. Ganss asserts: "It is safe to state that in distortion of authorities, in evasive sophistries, in excoriating sarcasms, in bearish personalities, he has seldom if ever been equalled. Passages are not wanting which on the other hand give us a display of generous impulses, kind benevolence, sympathetic gentleness, profuse hospitality, freedom from avarice, a joyous and companionable disposition, an exhaustless passion for work, a strong confidence in God, an exalted conception of prayer." . . . "A Scientific Theistic Argument," by Fr. H. Wyman, C.S.P., is a brief discussion of the metaphysical proof of God's existence, with some applications to current astronomical findings. . . . Fr. Sisbert Burkard, O.S.B., explains the laws of rhythm in Gregorian chant. . . . An interesting article, in view of recent events, is "The Future Conversion of Japan to the Catholic Faith," by Fr. C. Ferrand, a missionary in Tokyo. He describes a plan that is being tried to bring the knowledge of the faith to the educated classes, the establishment of residences under the care of Catholic missionaries for Japanese university students. . . . Fr. Charles Cronin, writing from Rome, concludes his series of articles opposing the "banquet-theory" of sacrifice, proposed by Bishop Bellord. . . . A simple method of remembering the names of the twelve apostles is suggested by a correspondent. He tells us that the letters of the word *Baptism* will give the initials of all these names, though we must bear in mind that the letter *i* (*j*) includes four names. . . . The Ecclesiastical Library Table contains a summary of recent Bible studies. . . . Among the book notices is a review of the recently published statutes of the diocese of Fall River.

F.J.C.

APPRAISAL IN SACRED THEOLOGY

What actually constitutes achievement in the field of sacred theology? By what objectively valid norms is a man rated as a competent, or even as an outstanding theologian? How can the oral or written teachings of any individual be classed correctly as contributions to the work or to the literature of sacred theology?

These are questions that must be faced and answered.

The matter is particularly urgent in this country today. In some rather articulate but not too well-informed Catholic circles it has become fashionable to appeal to the authority of certain "great theologians" in support of what can be most charitably described as highly questionable theses. And, interestingly enough, this tendency has been accompanied by some earnest efforts to discredit the great body of American theologians in writings addressed both to Americans and to Europeans.

Taken individually, no one of these attempts to misrepresent what is being taught and written in the field of sacred theology in the United States has any particular importance. The tendency they manifest, however, is certainly serious enough to be noticed and examined. It would surely be unfortunate if inaccurate teachings were to be offered to our people in the guise of outstanding contributions to the science of theology. And the Catholics of our country would be deceived and harmed were they to imagine that the priests who instruct them and preach to them have been given a second-rate training in the sacred science. They would be hurt still more if they were blindly to follow the guidance of some of those who have been presented to them as theologians of a higher class than those to be found in this country.

Two American writers, Mr. Erwin Geissman and Mr. Vincent J. Giese, have recently heaped enthusiastic praise on one group of European teachers of theology and have made it quite clear that they consider the great body of American theologians less competent than their heroes. The former, reviewing the symposium *Tolerance and the Catholic* for the periodical *The Commonweal,* describes the contributors to this symposium as "a fair part of the first team among the French speaking theologians." He then turns his attention to the United States. "Perhaps," he tells us, "the

first feeling of an American Catholic on glancing at the list of contributors is one of envy." And he asks: "Would it be possible to bring together in this country a group of comparably qualified men even if one might draw on the entire Western hemisphere?"[1]

Similarly, in his book, *The Apostolic Itch,* Mr. Giese grows lyrical about "the litany of European movements, centers, inspired men, all of which grew out of a growing need to re-incarnate Christianity in a de-Christianized Europe."[2] Under this heading, presumably as "inspired men," he lists a group of theologians, several of whom are best known in connection with doctrinal aberrations reproved by Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Humani generis.* He seems to agree with Mr. Geissman about the relative inferiority of American theologians. "What litany of achievements can we recite?" he asks. "To what men can we point? What intellectuals can we count?"[3]

From one point of view, this somewhat naïve depreciation of theology in the United States is only another manifestation of a phenomenon to which the Catholics of our country have long been accustomed. There is, and there long has been, an element among American Catholics which seems to enjoy making corporate and public acts of contrition for what are supposed to be deficiencies in the scientific or cultural achievements of our schools and the value of our literary productions. There would seem to be no particular reason why the work of our theologians should be exempted from the adverse criticism accorded by such individuals to the efforts of American Catholic educators and writers in general. Thus it is not too astonishing to encounter unfavorable judgments about the status of sacred theology in the United States from non-theologians like Mr. Giese and Mr. Geissman.

It would appear that there is another reason to explain the enthusiasm of men like Mr. Giese and Mr. Geissman for one group of overseas theologians and their unfavorable estimate of the teachers of sacred theology in their own country. The writers they extol are men with whom they agree, men who manifest a tendency with which they are in sympathy. Taken as a group, the

[1] *The Commonweal,* LXIII, 6 (Nov. 11, 1955), 145.

[2] Vincent J. Giese, *The Apostolic Itch* (Chicago: Fides Publishers, 1954), p. 103.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 104.

theologians in the United States have shown little liking for some of the theses and some of the writings of these European writers in the field of sacred theology.

Likewise, it is interesting to note that the generally unfavorable appraisal of American theologians made by Mr. Geise and Mr. Geissman runs parallel to, and may perhaps result from, a similar evaluation made by some European writers of liberal tendencies. One of these is Mr. François Mauriac, best known in this country as the author of the most inept Life of Christ written during the first half of the twentieth century. It is his contention that, "Unfortunately for ills of the spirit America has only material remedies to offer us."[4]

By all means the bitterest critic of theology and of theologians in the United States is Fr. George Tavard, A.A., a French priest now resident in this country, and, oddly enough, a member of the Catholic Theological Society of America. In 1954 he published in Paris a brochure, *A la rencontre du protestantisme,* in which he described Catholicism in the United States as characterized by, among other things, "un infantilisme spirituel et intellectuel."[5] Last year he published in this country his own translation of this brochure, under the title, *The Catholic Approach to Protestantism.* In this English version the corresponding passage is an assertion that, "Like all American groups, they [American Catholics] also suffer from a certain dearth of historical and theological culture."[6] Furthermore, even in the English version of his book, a work evidently intended for the American market, the author shows himself so little cognizant of the amenities that should characterize theological writing and discussion that he actually indulges in personal attacks against individual American theologians. In using personal vituperation instead of reasoning, Father Tavard seems to be following the usual pattern for liberals.

In the July 26, 1955, edition of *La Croix,* a daily paper conducted by Fr. George Tavard's Parisian confreres, there appeared an article entitled "Une 'Semaine théologique' en Amérique." It

[4] Mauriac, *Words of Faith* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1955), p. 56.

[5] *A la rencontre du protestantisme* (Paris: 1954), p. 51.

[6] *The Catholic Approach to Protestantism* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), p. 61.

purported to be an account of the tenth annual meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America, held in New York June 27-29 last year. It was duly signed by "G. T.," and it is fully imbued with the spirit of *A la rencontre du protestantisme.* The article was obviously animated by a blind and highly emotional antipathy towards most of the theologians who took part in the New York meeting, and to the spirit and the works of the Society. The publication of this biased and singularly offensive report reflects little credit on *La Croix* and its editorial staff.

The article in *La Croix* is such that any account of assertions and insinuations contained in it is at best a distasteful task. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this paper, it seems expedient that such an account should be given. The *La Croix* article appeals, sometimes explicitly and sometimes by clear implication, to certain standards which, in its author's mind, seem to justify his wholesale depreciation of American theologians and of their activity. The genuine norms by which the competence and the achievements of individual theologians can be accurately appraised should stand out in sharper relief when they are seen against the background of the false standards invoked in the *La Croix* article.

Furthermore, it is definitely a good thing for American priests to face the fact that, in "progressivist" or liberal Catholic circles, there is a fairly widespread and very profound prejudice against theological work in this country. What is most remarkable about "Une 'Semaine théologique' en Amérique" is to be found neither in its deep-seated anti-American animus nor in its offensive and misleading treatment of individual American theologians. It is the fact that such a screed could be published in as important and influential a journal as *La Croix.*

It is by no means beyond the bounds of possibility that an article as depreciative of and as insulting to the theologians of some foreign country as "Une 'Semaine théologique' en Amérique" is to American theologians might be written and submitted to some Catholic periodical in this country. Any Catholic editor in this country, however, would most certainly classify a manuscript of this kind as a barbarous and crackpot production. It is unthinkable that any Catholic periodical would publish it. The fact that "Une 'Semaine théologique' en Amérique" was actually published in

La Croix makes it obvious that, in this instance at least, the standards of that journal were amazingly low.

As a matter of fact the editorial staff of *La Croix* might not have been in a position to know that the charges made in this communication were groundless. But the editors could not possibly have failed to realize that this communication was both offensive and insulting, calculated to give the impression that the Catholic Theological Society of America was, by and large, not worth while as a theological organization. It is extremely difficult to understand the mentality of any Catholic editor who would even consider publishing an article of this sort.

"Une 'Semaine théologique' en Amérique" strives desperately to convey the impression that the American theologians who took part in last June's meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America were something less than competent, that the choice of topics for discussion at the meeting was inept, that the papers, with perhaps one exception, were unworthy of professional theologians, and that the discussion was banal. Its author reacts, in a fashion at once pharisaical and jocular, to the fact that the meeting of the Society was held amidst "le luxe de l'hôtel Commodore." One would expect that a priest would be very favorably impressed by the fact that, through the kindness of the archdiocesan authorities, several temporary altars were set up in the hotel itself for the convenience of the members who were living in the hotel during the time of the meeting. The author of the *La Croix* article, on the contrary, finds it amusing that these altars were set up in the "salle du bal Ouest." In the light of what he has seen, the author likewise recommends that some future meeting of the Society consider the relations between theology and the spirit of poverty and that some other meeting be devoted to meditation on the spirit of the liturgy. Incidentally, he says nothing about the fact that the Cardinal Archbishop of New York offered the Mass in the Lady Chapel of St. Patrick's Cathedral for the first morning session of the meeting. Neither does he mention the greetings extended to the Society and to the individual members by the Cardinal Archbishop on that occasion.

At the annual meetings of the Catholic Theological Society of America it is customary to devote one afternoon to certain elective seminars. Three or more of these meetings are held in various parts

of the hotel, and each meeting is given over to the discussion of a problem in some particular section of sacred theology. In spite of the fact that the correspondent for *La Croix* could not possibly have attended all of these elective seminars (since the individual meetings are held at the same time in separate rooms), he roundly condemns all of them.

> The presentation of the subject is a summary of the manuals, always. When anyone ventures outside of the manuals, it is at most to refer to some recent encyclicals and to some post-Tridentine authors. St. Thomas is greeted in passing. There is a tip of the hat to St. Augustine. The non-thomistic scholasticism and the Greek Fathers seem not to have existed.
>
> In other words, decadent scholasticism dominates the minds.

Throughout the *La Croix* article there is manifest a profound disregard for theological manuals. This disdain for the textbooks ordinarily employed in the instruction of seminarians is characteristic, of course, of individuals who support theses at variance with the Catholic doctrine generally found in these works. It is, unfortunately, by no means an unusual phenomenon in contemporary writing in the field of sacred theology. It is most virulent among those who were naïve enough to be impressed by the unpublished but widely disseminated writings in vogue in France shortly after the end of the second world war. It is not astonishing to find an individual of this sort so lacking in courtesy as to characterize the teachings of his hosts as "decadent."

The most vicious and ill-mannered part of the *La Croix* appraisal of American theologians, however, is to be found in its account of a discussion on penal laws that took place during the New York meeting of the society.

> When they [the members of the Society] are not dealing with questions that are in great measure useless, they add an hour or two to the interminable discussion of insoluble problems that attract certain moralists. Thus the last afternoon was devoted to a public discussion between two "theologians" speaking "for" and "against" the existence of penal laws (*à une discussion publique entre deux "theologiens" parlant "pour" et "contre" l'existence de lois pénales*). The arguments of the two disputants passed from one manual to another over a period of at least two centuries. This rather resembled the scholastic exercises held at the end of a school term. It was something unworthy of a gathering of teachers.

When the audience takes part in the debate, it asks questions that pupils usually raise.

The two theologians designated by the Society to discuss the question about penal laws were Fathers Matthew Herron, T.O.R., and Michael Noonan, S.M. The *La Croix* account of their discussion is maliciously untrue. The placing of quotations around the term "théologiens" in the text of that article was a monstrously boorish procedure, calculated only to discredit the individual who wrote the article and the editors who printed it.

It is interesting to note that the author of the *La Croix* article was not impressed with the selections of recipients of the Cardinal Spellman Award. Indeed, he gives the impression that he believes no genuine contribution to the field of sacred theology can be made in teaching this subject.

But to whom do the annual prizes go? To good professors. That is excellent. The professors ought to be encouraged. But perhaps we should also recognize the worth of theologians.

The writer for *La Croix* believes, among other things, that it might be a good thing to found a new theological society in this country, and to have this new one interest itself in "la recherche théologique." He tries by every means within his power to convince his readers that the present society is not at all concerned with the work of advancing the frontiers of theological knowledge. The obvious intention of the article is to spread abroad the impression that the members of the Catholic Theological Society of America "also suffer from a certain dearth of historical and theological culture."

In forming his unfavorable judgment about the status of sacred theology in the United States, Father Tavard, like others of his class, has employed standards of a sort. One of those standards is manifestly a vigorous anti-American prejudice. As a comparative newcomer to our shores he would hardly have had the opportunity to make any serious investigation of theological work in this country. Yet he blandly attributes a deficiency in theological culture to American Catholics in general, and, indeed, to Americans as a class. It is clear that such an assertion would never have been written were it not motivated by an antipathy to the United States and by a desire to pander to the anti-American sentiments current in certain "liberal" circles overseas.

Another explanation of Father Tavard's attitude is to be found in the fact that very few recognized teachers of sacred theology agree with one of his favorite theses. His book propounds a somewhat eccentric sort of oecumenicism, for which American theologians in general seem to have very little enthusiasm.

Despite the fact that some individuals do not employ them, there are very definite and effective standards by which the competence of an individual theologian and his contributions to theological science can be recognized. The *magisterium* of the Catholic Church can use and has used these criteria various ways. And, always acting with proper deference to the *magisterium,* any worker in the field of sacred theology can likewise employ them.

The first of these standards is doctrinal accuracy. Actually a man is a competent theologian only to the extent that his teaching, written or oral, is an accurate statement of the truth contained either formally or virtually in the deposit of divine public revelation. The individual who teaches, either openly or by the process of suggestion, some doctrine at variance with divinely revealed truth is, by that very fact, acting as an incompetent theologian.

The immediate standard of doctrinal accuracy in the field of sacred theology is none other than the immediate rule of faith itself, the actual teaching of the ecclesiastical *magisterium.* Hence, however brilliant and influential an individual writer or teacher may be, if he presents conclusions at variance with or opposed to the statements of the ecclesiastical *magisterium,* he is not acting as a competent theologian.

Furthermore, it is definitely not enough to have one's teachings in harmony with those solemn judgments of the *magisterium* in which dogmas of the Catholic faith are defined. This is brought out with special clarity in the letter *Tuas libenter* written Dec. 21, 1863, to the Archbishop of Munich, with reference to a meeting of German theologians held at that time. The following passage is particularly pertinent.

> And We also persuade Ourselves that these men [the theologians who took part in the assembly] do not want to assert that the perfect attachment to the revealed truths, which they have acknowledged as entirely necessary for the attainment of true progress of the sciences and for the refutation of errors, can be had if faith and obedience are given only to dogmas expressly defined by the Church. For, even if we

are dealing only with that act of subjection which is to be made in the act of divine faith, this must still not be limited to those things which have been defined by the express decrees of the Oecumenical Councils, or of the Roman Pontiffs, or of this See, but it must also be extended to those things that are set forth (*traduntur*) by the ordinary *magisterium* of the entire Church spread throughout the world, and that are therefore held by the universal and constant agreement of Catholic theologians to pertain to the faith.

But when we are dealing with that subjection to which all those Catholics who work in the field of the speculative sciences (*qui in contemplatrices scientias incumbunt*) are obligated in conscience in order that they may bring new helps to the Church by their writings, the men of this assembly ought to recognize the fact that it is not enough for intelligent Catholics to receive and to venerate the above-mentioned Catholic dogmas, but that it is likewise necessary that they subject themselves to the doctrinal decisions set forth by the Pontifical Congregations and to those points of doctrine which are retained by the common and constant agreement of Catholics as theological truths which are so certain that to render opinions opposed to these points of doctrine, if not heretical, are at least deserving of some other theological censure.[7]

Sacred theology is, after all, a science. Mistakes are not contributions to theology any more than they are to any other science. And there is no such thing as genuinely competent theological activity which results in the contradiction of what has been taught by the *magisterium* of the Catholic Church, or in the denial of the meaning which has always been attached to existent documents and statements of the teaching Church.

The second valid standard for the appraisal of theologians and of theological works is that of theological procedure. Accuracy and adherence to the teaching of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* are definitely requisite in a competent theologian and in a worthwhile contribution to the science of sacred theology, but they are by no means sufficient to constitute a theologian as competent or to render his work a genuine contribution to theology. Sacred theology is a science, or, to put it more exactly, theological knowledge is scientific knowledge, according to the Aristotelian concept of scientific knowledge. The theologian is expected, not only to present accurate teaching, doctrine strictly in conformity with the

[7] *Denz.*, 1683 f.

statements of the Church's *magisterium,* but also to prove or to demonstrate the propositions he sets forth.

If the proposition he is teaching is objectively certain and thus patient of a certain demonstration within the field of theological procedure, it is definitely the business of the individual theologian to offer a completely apodeictic proof for it. If, on the other hand, the thesis he is offering has only the status of an opinion, than the reasons alleged in its favor should at least be serious and highly pertinent.

The correct theological procedure involves proper reasoning and the correct and adequate use of sources. On the first count there are some contemporary textbooks in dogmatic theology which, in the "proof from reason" they offer in support of certain of their theses, are rather obviously imperfect. These *demonstrationes ex ratione* should be processes in which the thesis stands as the legitimate and certain conclusion arrived at through a valid act of reasoning. When this condition is not verified, the work of the theologian responsible for the faulty "demonstration" is not only poor from a scientific point of view, but actually harmful. When an imperfect attempt at a proof is offered in support of a certain or an objectively *"de fide"* thesis in sacred theology, a learner is certainly inclined to gain the impression that this is the best sort of justification that can be advanced for the acceptability of the thesis. And, if such an impression remains with a man, even subconsciously, his value as a theologian, or as a teacher of the revealed word of God, is tremendously impaired.

In all frankness, however, we should be prepared to admit that there is a condition existent in the present organization of the theological schools which definitely tends to be detrimental to proper procedure in the field of sacred theology. Far too many of our present-day manuals have continued the somewhat outworn habit of partisan debate on a point of theology on which there has been controversial discussion for over three and a half centuries. From the scientific point of view, the status of that controversy today is far inferior to what it was in the days when Molina wrote his *Concordia* and Francis Sylvius answered him with the *De motione primi motoris.*

Theology is a science and should be treated as one. It is difficult to imagine another science in which a difference of opinion which arose three and a half centuries ago would still remain unresolved

today. The crystallization of theological schools on this point has been most unfortunate for the well-being of sacred theology. The vital exigencies of the present day have rendered the continuation of this state of affairs less than excusable, and the action of the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities with reference to the famed twenty-four theses should point the way to an alleviation of this condition.[8]

The correct and adequate use of sources in the study of sacred theology is also definitely a part of proper theological procedure. In the presentation of his theses the scholastic theologian must, if he is to work competently, use the sources requisite for the explanation and the demonstration of his teaching. Quite obviously he will not be in a position ordinarily to employ every source available for every thesis. Nevertheless, if he is to do his work well, and to act as a competent theologian, he must make use of all of the sources that are needed for the adequate and correct exposition of his doctrine. And, in the field of positive theology, he must show a mastery of the sources upon which he is working, and an adequate knowledge of the literature about these sources.

Another norm that must be used in the evaluation of the work of an individual theologian is timeliness. The man who works in the field of sacred theology is expected to be something more than an animated duplicating machine or tape recorder. It is definitely not enough for him to repeat, even very effectively, what previous theologians have said and written. It is his business, as a teacher of Catholic truth, to express that truth effectively in terms of the problems and the questions of the time in which he is actually working. He should be able to use his own language well enough to teach in it accurately, clearly, and effectively.

Thus if, in some of the Catholic literature available to himself and to those for whom he is working, there should be confused or misleading pronouncements on the subjects he is supposed to teach, a teacher or writer would not be acting as a competent theologian were he to present his subject with no reference to these misleading statements.

[8] For an excellent commentary on these theses, see Guido Mattiussi, S.J., *Les points fondamentaux de la philosophie thomiste: Commentaire des vingt-quatre thèses approuvées par la S. Congrégation des Études* (Torino: Marietti, 1926).

There is a definite contribution to the science of sacred theology when a man for the first time presents some aspect of a theological teaching explicitly. It is quite clear that no theologian is going to discover some new area of truth in the field of revealed doctrine. But since, according to the teaching of the Vatican Council's dogmatic constitution *Dei Filius,* a man acquires an understanding of the sacred mysteries through instituting a process of comparison between the revealed truths and truths known naturally, and also between individual revealed truths, it can well be the privilege of a scholastic theologian to arrive, through the workings of such a process, at an explicit statement of some aspect of theological truth which had hitherto been presented only in an implicit or virtual fashion.

Still in the field of scholastic theology, there can be a genuine contribution made whenever there is a more thorough analysis of sources pertinent to some thesis. In the realm of positive theology, there is manifestly a genuine and worth-while contribution whenever there is an advance in the knowledge of documents dealing with the revealed message and its presentation.

Obviously these norms have to be applied to work that is manifested. The manifestation of theological work is made in writings issued by an individual theologian, in his oral teaching, and in the direction of dissertations or other writings. It is idle to imagine, as the correspondent of *La Croix* obviously does, that there is no possibility of any outstanding contribution to sacred theology to be made precisely in the line of teaching.

One example may not be out of place. Those of us who were privileged to be instructed by him revere the late Archbishop Emil Yelle as one of the outstanding theologians of our time. While he was still a professor, and later the superior, at the Grand Seminary at Montreal, he was a magnificently successful teacher of sacred theology. He could bring out the meaning of a theological thesis as few have ever been able to do. By reason of the offices with which he was burdened, Archbishop Yelle never had the opportunity of writing books or articles in any way commensurate with his theological attainments. Yet it would be ridiculous to deny that he, and others like him, have contributed mightily to the science of sacred theology.

Individuals like Father Tavard seem to imagine that great, or even competent theologians, are to be found only in the somewhat

restricted circle of a self-appointed elite, a circle from which, fortunately, most American theologians are excluded. In point of fact, however, most of our teachers of sacred theology are quite competent workers in their field. In theology, as in every other line of endeavor, there are obviously degrees of competence, and some work more effectively than others. Yet, as we have learned, particularly through the meetings of the Catholic Theological Society of America, the great majority of the hundreds of teachers of sacred theology in this country and in Canada are, judged by the objectively valid norms for appraising achievement in the field of theology, excellent theologians. They teach accurately and in full conformity with the doctrine of the ecclesiastical *magisterium*. They back up their theses correctly, and with the adequate and proper use of pertinent sources. In their teaching they take cognizance of the difficulties and the problems of the world in which they live.

Some of these men have made notable contributions to the science and to the literature of sacred theology. They have offered insights into Catholic doctrine which have been accurate, and which have aided their fellows in an appreciable way. Their work will not suffer, nor will their influence for good be diminished, through the tendentious and irresponsible attacks made against them by men who have little or no competence in the field of sacred theology.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

INTERPRETATION OF THE EUCHARISTIC FAST CONCESSIONS

Question: In interpreting the recent eucharistic fast concessions may we hold that the "one hour" that must intervene between the taking of liquid nourishment and the beginning of Mass or the reception of Holy Communion (presuming sufficient reasons for the concessions are present) can be understood *morally* rather than *physically?* Thus, may a priest begin Mass fifty-five minutes after taking a cup of coffee? Or, at least, can it be said that this would be only a venial sin? Furthermore, in view of the great leniency manifested by the Church in these recent concessions, can we say that there can now be parvity of matter in the observance of the eucharistic fast, so that a person would commit only a venial sin if he received Holy Communion after taking a small quantity of solid food?

Answer: To all these questions a negative answer must be given. The concessions granted by the Holy See in the matter of the eucharistic fast are very definite; outside of these the law continues unchanged. One of the chief characteristics of this law is its complete gravity. It admits of no parvity of matter in respect to the computation of time and the amount of food or drink that breaks the fast. Hence, it must be regarded as objectively a mortal sin to shorten by a single moment the hour between the taking of liquid nourishment and the beginning of Mass or the reception of Holy Communion, or to receive Holy Communion after the smallest amount of solid food. In the words of Father Ford, S.J.: "Suppose someone has fasted only fifty-five minutes from liquids; or suppose he has taken only a minute quantity of forbidden solids along with the liquids. If such a one thereupon went to Communion, could he be said to be sinning only venially, because he

has failed to observe the fasting conditions in such a small matter? The answer must be negative. . . . If one has not fulfilled the conditions of the fast and goes to Holy Communion, one sins mortally" (*The New Eucharistic Legislation,* p. 70).

THE ABLUTIONS AT A MORNING MASS

Question: when a priest celebrates two Masses on the same day, one in the morning and the other in the evening, should he take both wine and water for the ablutions at the first Mass, or only water?

Answer: The Constitution *Christus Dominus* quite explicitly states that "those who say Mass twice or three times may take the ablutions; in this case, however, the ablutions should consist of water only, not of wine" (Rule IV). This ruling makes no distinction as to the time of the second (or third) Mass, whether it be celebrated in the morning or in the evening; hence, it is logical to conclude that when a priest is to celebrate an evening Mass he should take only water for the ablutions in the morning Mass or Masses. It is true, the Instruction of the Holy Office, issued in conjunction with *Christus Dominus,* decreed that "if a priest who has to (*debet*) celebrate Mass twice or three times should inadvertently take wine also in the ablution, he is not forbidden to say the second and third Mass" (Rule 8). It is to be noted that this refers to an *inadvertent* use of wine for the ablution. Moreover, the use of the word *debet* seems to indicate some necessity of celebrating the other Mass or Masses (for example, on a Sunday when no other priest is available or even on a weekday when a Mass has been announced) as distinct from a Mass or Masses or mere devotion, such as the private celebration of the second and third Mass on Christmas and All Souls' Day. It should be noted, however, that Father Ford, S.J., believes that it is not improbable that a priest who has inadvertently taken wine at the ablution of the first Mass on one of these days might say his other Masses even though they are merely *ex devotione.* His argument is that this Latin construction with *debet* can also express a simple future.

ADVANTAGES FROM AN EARLIER SYSTEM OF TIME

Question: In discussing the advantages of choosing different systems of time for the eucharistic fast, the private recitation of the Divine Office, etc., as permitted by Canon 33, § 1, we generally refer to the benefits gained by using a later system than the one in common use—for example, the extra hour allowed us for beginning the eucharistic fast when daylight saving time prevails. But we seldom hear of advantages that may be gained through the use of a system of time that is earlier than the system in common use. Will you please mention some benefits that might be gained in this way?

Answer: We are all familiar with the advantages accruing from the use of daylight saving time (DST), legally authorized in certain states at certain times of the year. Thus, by employing DST one may begin to eat meat on Friday night when it is actually only 11 p.m. by standard time (ST). But many Catholics are not aware of the advantages that may be gained when ST is in vogue by using local mean time (LMT) or local true time (LTT). The best table of these systems, to my knowledge, is that which is published annually at St. Paul's College, Washington, D. C. The difference between LMT and ST is given in one table for the principal cities of the United States and Canada in terms of plus or minus a certain number of minutes, to the extent that LMT is after or before ST, respectively. This is the same at all times of the year. In another table the difference between LTT and LMT is given. This varies with the season of the year. LTT may be as much as 14 minutes later or 16 minutes earlier than LMT. It is recommended that priests familiarize themselves with these different systems of time, as they apply to their particular locality, both for their own use and for the guidance of the laity. The advantages to which our questioner refers can occur only on days when the figure is minus for the particular locality or season of the year.

Let us take some practical cases—first, in regard to the law of abstinence. On Friday night one could begin to eat meat as soon as it is midnight by a system previous to ST, provided that he has completed twenty-four hours of abstinence. (Thus, one could not eat meat on Friday night by the earlier system if he had eaten meat up to midnight Thursday by the later system.) Supposing the fulfillment of this condition, a person in Boston could eat meat

every Friday night after 11:44 p.m. according to ST (which would be midnight according to LMT). Moreover, at certain seasons of the year, especially the late fall, greater latitude would be allowed. Thus, from October 26 to November 12 one could eat meat in Boston on Friday night beginning with 11:28 p.m. ST (midnight LTT); in Portland, Maine, beginning with 11:25 ST; in Louisville, Ky., beginning with 11:24 ST. It must be emphasized, however, that the anticipation of a non-abstinence day must be taken relative to midnight by ST, not by DST. Moreover, LTT may vary slightly from year to year. I am taking the figures for 1955.

Again, in determining what is a "late Mass" (after 9 a.m.) for the use of the new eucharistic fast privileges, we could use these systems of LMT and LTT to advantage. Thus, in Providence, R. I., any morning Mass begun after 8:46 ST (9 o'clock LMT) is a late Mass, and the celebrating priest could take liquid nourishment up to 7:46 ST. In the most favorable season, mentioned above, even a Mass after 8:30 ST is a "late Mass" in Providence. A priest having the privilege of beginning a private Mass at 2 a.m., granted to the members of some religious orders, could gain advantages sometimes by the use of LMT or LTT. Thus, in Chicago, a priest with such a privilege could always begin Mass at 1:51 ST and at the favorable season at 1:35 ST.

Some priests use the various systems of time to delay their Office as long as possible. But others might wish to act in the opposite way. Hence, if a priest in San Diego desires to begin his Little Hours as soon as possible he can always start at 11:48 p.m., by ST of the previous day (which is midnight by LMT) and at the favorable season he could begin at 11:32 p.m. by ST (midnight by LTT).

In some places there is little or no advantage gained by the use of LMT and LTT in the matter of anticipation. Thus, in Washington, D. C., the earliest moment of midnight, when standard time is in use, would be 11:52 p.m. (midnight by LTT) and that would occur only during the most favorable period in the fall. In Pittsburgh, where LMT is twenty minutes later than ST there would never be any benefit of the kind we are discussing.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

BLACK ANTEPENDIUM

Question: Is the black antependium ever permitted on the main altar?

Answer: Wapelhorst, Fortescue, Wuest-Mullaney are among the authors who maintain that a violet antependium should be used for a Requiem Mass or Funeral Mass which is celebrated at an altar where the Blessed Sacrement is reserved. On the other hand such authorities as Van der Stappen and Stercky hold that a black antependium may be used for a Requiem or a Funeral Mass even before an altar where the Blessed Sacrement is reserved, provided such "is the only or principal altar." Father Sadlowski in his dissertation submitted to The Catholic University of America goes along with Wapelhorst and Fortescue. He adds in a footnote that "such an opinion [Van der Stappen, Stercky, etc.] seems to be contrary to the decrees of the S.R.C."

REPEATED BENEDICTIONS

Question: Only one Benediction with the monstrance may be given to the same group on the same day. May we interpret this *strictly* and have another Benediction service with the monstrance if there be just one or more less in the group?

Answer: Permission of the Most Reverend Ordinary is required for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, apart from the feast of Corpus Christi. We have no right to interpret as our inquirer would do and schedule Benediction a second time on the same day.

BEDROOM OVER ALTAR

Question: What is the law regarding a bedroom over a chapel where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved? We are remodelling an old house for the use of our Sisters. We are badly in need of space and would like to make use of a room directly over the sanctuary of the proposed chapel. One half would be used for a sewing room and the remaining part for sleeping quarters.

Answer: The Congregation of Sacred Rites in various decrees has strongly affirmed the fact that "an altar on which Mass is celebrated, or at which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, may not be built under an apartment used as a bedroom." We even hesitate to recommend the use of this space over the proposed chapel for a sewing room, because when an emergency arises, the first thought will be to convert it into a bedroom. At best it would be safer to reserve such a room for storage purposes.

VESPERS FOLLOWED BY BENEDICTION

Question: When solemn Benediction follows Vespers immediately, is it permissible for the celebrant to leave the sanctuary to vest with amice, alb, etc., and return to the altar with the deacon and subdeacon?

Answer: Certainly we see nothing wrong in the celebrant repairing to the sacristy to vest and return with the deacon and subdeacon for Benediction. However, it seems much more convenient to have the celebrant vest completely before Vespers. When it comes time for Benediction, the deacon and subdeacon approach the altar with the thurifer to meet the celebrant.

NEWLY ORDAINED AND INDULGENCES

Question: Is there an indulgence attached to the blessing of a newly ordained priest?

Answer: As far as we know, there is no special indulgence attached to the first blessing of a newly ordained priest. There is, however, an indulgence of seven years for all the faithful who assist at the First Mass of a newly ordained priest. Likewise, an indulgence of one hundred days can be gained by those who kiss the palms of the hands of a newly ordained priest on the day of his ordination as well as the day of First Mass. Relatives within the third degree can gain a plenary indulgence if they assist at the first Mass, go to confession and receive Holy Communion, and pray for the intention of the Holy Father.

GROUP DISPENSATIONS FOR THE EUCHARISTIC FAST

Question: There is a group of people who belong to my parish and by the fact that they live in the country some distance from the church, they find it difficult to keep the Eucharistic fast. May I as their pastor dispense the entire group according to the decree of 1953?

Answer: Father William Conway (*The New Law on the Eucharistic Fast*) answers this question thus: "We believe the correct view is that the consilium must be given to each individual person separately. Once again the conclusion seems to follow inescapably from the fact that the consilium must be given in the internal forum. A general announcement from the pulpit could not possibly be regarded as an event in the internal forum. . . . What does seem clear is that the legislator, as a brake against obviously possible abuses, insisted that no lay-person may avail himself of these concessions without first consulting a priest in the internal forum and that, of itself, seems to rule out group permissions. This is also the view of Hurth, Obernhumer and Regatillo. On the other hand, Reed, Meunier, Connell, Bride and Carpentier do not rule out group permissions—in the case of small groups where the priest is quite certain that each individual member fulfills all the conditions."

LEONINE PRAYER INTENTION

Question: I would appreciate it if in your column you would recall for us the papal intentions for the prayers after Mass. It seems to me that I recall that these prayers were ordered by Pope Pius XII to be said "For Peace." But, in any case, I know some priests who offer these prayers "For Peace" and others who still offer them for the original intentions of Leo XIII, "the conversion of Russia." Would you clarify this?

Answer: To the best of our knowledge these prayers are still recited for the conversion of Russia. Leo XIII in 1884 and again in 1886 ordered these special prayers to be said after a private

Mass for the needs of the Church. This prescription was renewed by Pius X in 1903 and by Benedict XV in 1015. Pius XI, on June 30, 1930, ordered these prayers to be said for Russia and "directed the bishops and priests carefully to inform their congregations of this fact and frequently remind them of it."

RENEWAL OF SACRED SPECIES

Question: We have three convents within our parish limits. We celebrate Mass daily in one of them. In order to change the Blessed Sacrament in the other two chapels we consecrate the hosts in church and then bring them to the convent chapels in a pyx, returning the replaced hosts to the church for consumption the following day. Rather than do this, is it not required that Mass be celebrated at each convent at least once every two weeks?

Answer: Such a practice is an outrage. One might be inclined to ask, "What next?" It is so easy in this particular case to offer Mass in each convent on separate days, at which time the Sacred Species can be renewed. Furthermore, most dioceses, since the decree *Christus Dominus,* grant permission to binate when it is necessary to renew the Sacred Species at a convent chapel.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

October 1:

Delegates to the 12th Congress of the International Union of Cities and Local Authorities meeting in Rome were granted an audience with Pope Pius XII. His Holiness stressed the fact that the city is the mother-cell of civilization. With this in view he asked that the cultural and religious traditions of their cities be used to bring about a more solid unity among nations themselves. Among the American cities represented were New York, San Francisco, Washington, and St. Louis.

October 3:

On the feast of the Little Flower, Pope Pius XII spoke again on Catholic Action. The occasion was an audience granted in St. Peter's Basilica to 15,000 girls, all members of Italian Catholic Action. His Holiness said that our present age is a time of decision in the history of Christianity. He took for an example the tremendous strides that may be made by a peaceful application of scientific knowledge to human life—strides which some years ago would have been thought impossible. His Holiness remarked: "It would seem that today God is preparing something truly unusual for the whole of mankind. . . ." In conclusion he strongly urged the girls to become militant Catholics—ones whose lives would be based on a strong faith, unreserved loyalty to the Church and a readiness for apostolic work and, if need be, heroism in carrying out the work of the Church.

October 4:

Taking another very modern problem, the Holy Father spoke to 500 delegates attending the Second World Congress of the International Highway Federation concerning driving. He gave these road experts from all over the world his rule of the road—Christian charity. Praising their efforts to awaken driver respon-

sibilities, His Holiness said that courtesy, moderation and prudence should be of paramount consideration on today's highways. "It is necessary," said the Pope, "to instill in all drivers a sense of their grave duty to respect the lives of others." While police can do much to cut down driving hazards, they cannot stop perils brought about by drivers who are "carried away by a passion for speed or intoxication." The complete text of this address by Our Holy Father is given at the end of this review.

October 9:

The Holy Father welcomed some 80,000 Italian Catholic athletes in St. Peter's Square. His Holiness asserted that sports, just as any other aspect of life, needs Christian principles to guide it. The exercise of sport therefore should not be an end in itself, nor should it in any way hamper the carrying out of the duties attached to the person's state of life. Sports therefore should be directed to the intellectual and moral perfection of the soul. The Holy Father also had some words for spectators and organizers. They have a responsibility to refrain from asking for an inhuman strain on the part of the athletes.

October 13:

Speaking to the members of the Italian Study Center for International Reconciliation, Pope Pius XII once more laid down the Church's answer to world tensions. Peace is the work of the Church. Co-existence in fear and co-existence in error will certainly not bring lasting peace to the world. Therefore, the Holy Father urged statesmen to build a lasting world peace on the Natural Law—a peace of co-existence in truth and in charity. Mankind, said the Pontiff, has always sought a means by which to judge recurring disputes; and the Church has likewise always striven to show mankind the clear, defined law of Nature.

By the Natural Law man as a rational being has an awareness in his very constitution of right and wrong. This law, engraved on man's conscience by God, governs all men, and applies to all fields of endeavor. The "jus gentium" is derived from the Natural Law, and any community of nations must thus be guided by the Natural Law. Just as the Natural Law shows man the path to the

common good, so also must any international organization govern for the common good, dropping national selfishness.

October 21:

The delegates of the European Radio Union were addressed by the Holy Father on the occasion of their convention in Rome. The Pope spoke to them about television. As a means of visual communication, television, said His Holiness, has a tremendous potentiality to allow shut-ins and others to take part in religious events. He stressed its role as an educational medium, but cautioned that it could never replace the direct teacher-pupil relationship. Television can also serve as a means for family unity, but he again warned that it could never take precedence over other essential spiritual and moral means for family unity. In conclusion he brought out the moral obligations of TV directors. They must strive to produce programs in conformity with the standards of Christian morality.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.CARM.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

ADDRESS ON HIGHWAY SAFETY BY POPE PIUS XII[1]

We are happy to have the honor of your visit, gentlemen, and to extend to your distinguished assembly Our encouragement and best wishes. The Second World Congress of the International Road Federation, which brings you to Rome this year, is interesting not only to highway engineers but also to traffic experts, public officials, specialists in economics and law, and prominent people in the political, industrial, and commercial life of the fifty-two nations which now make up your Federation. It is because of the importance of your work and the interest in the results of your pursuits that We now address you.

[1] Delivered by His Holiness on Oct. 4, 1955, to the delegates to the Second World Congress of the International Highway Federation.

One common thought animates your studies and discussion: good highways are necessary for the social and economic development of people. You resemble a group of scholars and doctors who examine the circulatory system of a living body in order to understand its nature and its laws, its normal and abnormal functioning. The great part of the life of a country truly streams through its highways: the principal arteries lead off to smaller roads, then to lanes, which carry to the farthermost parts of the body-social the resources necessary to its existence. Not only material goods travel the highways, but those of the spirit borrow this means of communication in order to reach man. Is it not from the movement of caravans that the vast historical phenomena, like Buddhism and Islamism, spread through the centuries to diverse nations? And the wonderful roads of the Roman Empire, did they not help to spread the Christian religion in the ancient world? The mind marvels, comparing the precarious conditions of travel up to the last century with the results obtained through the patience and energy of man: voyages, discoveries, arts, industry and commerce have depended entirely, or in large measure, on the highways.

Today, however, these problems have taken on a vastness and a complexity that is entirely new. This revolution is due principally to the appearance of the automobile. From the first experiments with the automobile until the last years of the past century, the motor vehicles imposed a terrible strain on the road. The peaceful rolling over the road of the early vehicles now became a succession of violent strokes hitting the road at a tangent and transferring the shock back to the car. The roads were soon full of ruts, and the clouds of dust raised by the cars clearly showed their rapid deterioration. The problem thus created forced the finding of a solution. A more durable and resistant road surface was sought, which necessarily was more costly; but the advantage of automobile travel warranted the imposing of high motor vehicle taxes. From this new state of things came extensive research, studies and experimentation, which are precisely your concern, gentlemen, and in which We have a lively interest, primarily because of their social importance.

The present highway problems appear to be closely connected with the recent utilization of new sources of energy, which enables

man to save more and more of his time and strength. From a simple possibility, the saving of energy quickly became a stern necessity: under pressure of competition, individuals, commercial and industrial organizations, entire nations are obliged to enter into this gigantic and universal speed race, which characterizes modern civilization. Otherwise, there is financial ruin, economic destruction. Now the highway, means of communication, enters the contest as a necessary, at times decisive, element. That is why today's roads must be so serviceable and so safe, in a word, so perfect.

Without entering here into the technical and legal aspects of the question, We wish to observe that financial benefits should never supersede human needs. It would be wrong to use public funds for the construction or maintenance of a highway system to serve particular interests, while less favored peoples have an urgent need to be freed from their state of inferiority by access to civilization, which depends in large measure on the means of communication. To open a road is like opening an economic market, introducing the blessings of medicine and hygiene, of instruction and religion: dispensaries, schools and missions will see their activity multiplied and extended. Along with them, health of soul and of body will penetrate deeply into the region. There is no man with a heart who will not be moved by these considerations, and it is the duty of those who can, to use their influence with strength and generosity. By doing so, they will merit the gratitude of all those who have a sense of human brotherhood.

In addition to the solving of traffic problems, your Federation carries on an important work of social education, for which We are pleased to commend you; a work, We wish to point out, which deals with the formation of a most acute sense of responsibility toward all users of the highway. Who has not given, in fact, anxious thought to the too great number of accidents of which the road is the theater? Today's cars, more numerous, speedier, and heavier, create an ever-increasing danger for each other and for pedestrians. There are many and varied causes of accidents, some material, others psychological. As to the first, men are applying themselves, We hope, to the task of finding a completely efficacious remedy. But it is also necessary to inculcate in everyone a sense of

his grave duty to respect the lives of others. A salutary fear of immediate and adequate repressive measures undoubtedly will contribute toward this end; but the police alone cannot prevent perils created by drivers scarcely masters of themselves, led on by the passion for speed or, at times, intoxicated. It is important to observe of one's own accord a strict discipline, conforming to established and generally accepted rules. The often dramatic consequences of violating the traffic code give its observance an extrinsic obligatory character far more serious than people generally think. Drivers cannot count on their own ability and watchfulness to avoid accidents: they must maintain a proper margin of safety in order to cope with the careless driver and unforeseen difficulties.

We wish to believe that your concern, which is also Ours, will not be without effect, and a better educated public opinion will create on the highways an atmosphere of courtesy, moderation and prudence corresponding to the best traditions of Christian civilization.

Let Us also, gentlemen, speak a word about the thoughts suggested to Us by the beautiful volumes in which you present to your readers some truly remarkable examples of the motor industry, noble achievements of human skill and work. Looking at the lines of cars dashing down the broad highways, a question—not without some anguish—arose in Our Heart: Where do all these people go so speedily? Are they driven on by a sense of duty, or a passion for money? Is it their desire to serve or to dominate their neighbor? And We thought of the precept of charity, of the word which sums up the whole teaching of the Divine Master: "Love one another as I have loved you" (*John* 15:12). "All things whatever you would that men should do to you, even so do you also to them" (*Matt.* 7:12). Let this charity always animate the hearts and wills of men. It is the light of the world, and those who follow it do not walk in the dark (cf. *John* 8:12).

To conclude, in wishing that the harmonious union of your efforts may contribute greatly to the general welfare of society and may promote the peaceful relations to which the whole world aspires, We beg God to pour forth His grace upon you and We impart to you, your families, and all those dear to you, Our paternal Apostolic Blessing.

The Sacred Congregation of Rites

A GENERAL DECREE

BY WHICH THE LITURGICAL ORDER OF HOLY WEEK IS RENEWED

From apostolic times Holy Mother Church has taken care each year to celebrate the principal mysteries of our Redemption, namely the passion, death and resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ, with an absolutely singular commemoration.

At first, the supreme moments of these mysteries, those of "the crucified, buried, and risen" Christ (St. Augustine, *Ep.* 55, 14), were recalled in a special three-day period. Soon a solemn commemoration of the institution of the most Holy Eucharist was added. Finally, on the Sunday immediately preceding the passion, a liturgical celebration of the triumphant messianic entry of Our Lord and King into the holy city was added. Thus there arose a special liturgical week which, by reason of the greatness of the mysteries celebrated, was designated as "Holy" and was enriched with exceptionally complete and sacred ceremonies.

In the beginning these rites were performed on the same days of the week and at the same hours of the day that the sacred mysteries occurred. Thus the institution of the Holy Eucharist was recalled on Thursday evening by the solemn Mass of the Lord's Supper. On Friday there was a special liturgical function in the hours after noon recalling the Lord's passion and death. Finally, on Holy Saturday night, there began a solemn vigil which ended the following morning with the joy of the resurrection.

During the Middle Ages they began for various pertinent reasons to set an earlier time for the performance of liturgical services on those days, so that towards the end of that period all of these liturgical services had been transferred to the morning. This did not take place without detriment to the liturgical meaning and confusion between the Gospel narratives and the liturgical ceremonies attached to them. The solemn liturgy of the Easter vigil in particular lost its original clarity and the meaning of its words and symbols when it was torn from its proper nocturnal setting. Moreover, Holy Saturday, with too early a recollection of the Easter gladness intruding into it, lost its original character as a day of mourning for the burial of the Lord.

In more recent times another change, very serious from a pastoral point of view, took place. For many centuries Thursday, Friday and Saturday of Holy Week were holy days of obligation, so that the Christian people, freed from servile works, could be present at the ceremonies taking place on those days. During the course of the seventeenth century, however, the Roman Pontiffs themselves were compelled, because of the complete change in the condition of social life, to reduce the number of the holydays of obligation. And so Urban VIII was compelled in his Apostolic Constitution *Universa per orbem,* of Sept. 24, 1642, to declare that the last three days of Holy Week were no longer holydays of obligation and to classify them as the working days.

Hence the attendance of the faithful at these ceremonies necessarily decreased, especially because the services had long been moved back to the morning hours when schools, factories, and public business of every kind are usually open and functioning on working days throughout the world. As a matter of fact, common and almost universal experience shows that these solemn and important liturgical services of the last three days of Holy Week are often conducted by the clergy in church buildings that are almost deserted.

This is certainly to be regretted, since these liturgical services of Holy Week are endowed not only with a singular dignity, but also with a special sacramental force and efficacy for nourishing Christian life.

Nor can there be proper compensation for the loss of these liturgical functions through those pious devotional exercises which are customarily called extra-liturgical and which are performed in the afternoon hours of these three days.

For these reasons during recent years experts on the liturgy, priests having the care of souls, and especially the Bishops have sent earnest petitions to the Holy See begging that the liturgical functions of the last three days of Holy Week be restored to the hours after noon, as formerly, so that all the faithful might more easily be present at these services.

After considering the case carefully, Pope Pius XII restored the liturgy of the sacred vigil of Easter in 1951. The celebration was to be held at the discretion of the Ordinary and as an experiment.

This experiment was highly successful everywhere, as many Ordinaries reported to the Holy See. These same Ordinaries also renewed their petitions for a liturgical restoration for the other two days, asking that the sacred functions be moved back to the evening hours as had been done in the case of the Easter Vigil. Moreover, evening Masses, provided for in the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* of Jan. 6, 1953, were being said everywhere and were attended by many. With all these things in mind Pope Pius XII commanded that the Commission for the Restoration of the Liturgy established by him examine the question of restoring the Ordo of Holy Week and propose a solution. After obtaining that answer, His Holiness decreed, as the seriousness of the affair demanded, that the entire question be subjected to a special examination by the Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

The Cardinals gathered in an extraordinary session at the Vatican on July 19 of this year. They considered the affair thoroughly and voted unanimously that the restored Ordo of Holy Week be approved and prescribed, subject to the approval of the Holy Father.

After all this had been reported in detail to the Holy Father by the undersigned Cardinal Prefect, His Holiness deigned to approve what the Cardinals had decided.

Hence, by special mandate of the same Pope Pius XII, the Sacred Congregation of Rites has decreed the following:

I. THE RESTORED ORDO FOR HOLY WEEK IS PRESCRIBED

1. Those who follow the Roman rite are bound in the future to follow the Restored Ordo for Holy Week, set forth in the original Vatican edition. Those who follow other Latin rites are bound to follow only the time established in the new Ordo for the liturgical services.

2. This new Ordo must be followed from March 25, the second Sunday of Passiontide or Palm Sunday, 1956.

3. Throughout the entire Holy Week no commemoration is admitted and, in the Mass, "orationes imperatae," however they may have been ordered, are also forbidden.

II. ON THE PROPER HOURS FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE SACRED LITURGY OF HOLY WEEK

On the Divine Office

4. On the second Sunday of Passiontide or Palm Sunday and on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week the divine office is said at the usual hours.

5. During the last three days of Holy Week, that is on the Thursday of the Lord's Supper, the Friday of the Lord's passion and death and Holy Saturday, the following rules are to be observed if the office is said in choir or in common:

Matins and Lauds are not anticipated, but are recited in the morning at the proper time. However, in cathedral churches where the Mass of the Chrism is being said on Holy Thursday morning, the Matins and Lauds of Holy Thursday can be anticipated.

The little hours are said at the proper time.

Vespers are omitted on Thursday and Friday when the principal liturgical functions of those days take their place. On Holy Saturday, however, they are said after noon at the accustomed hours.

Compline is said after the evening liturgical functions on Thursday and Friday. On Holy Saturday it is omitted.

In private recitations of the office on these three days, all the canonical hours should be recited according to the rubrics.

On the Mass or the Principal Liturgical Function

6. On Palm Sunday the solemn Benediction and the Procession of Palms are held in the morning at the accustomed hour. Where the office is said in choir, the proper time is after Terce.

7. On the Thursday of the Lord's Supper the Mass of the Chrism is celebrated after Terce. The Mass of the Lord's Supper, however, is celebrated in the evening at the most convenient time, but not before five P.M. nor after eight P.M.

8. On the Friday of the Lord's passion and death the solemn liturgical service is celebrated in the afternoon about three o'clock. If there is some pastoral reason to do so, it is allowable to choose a later hour, but not after 6 P.M.

9. The solemn Easter vigil is to be celebrated at a fitting time, one which will permit the solemn Mass of this vigil to begin about

midnight of the night between Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday. Where the conditions of the faith and of the place make it fitting in the judgment of the Ordinary to anticipate the hour for celebrating the vigil, this should not begin before twilight, or certainly not before sunset.

III. ON EXTENDING LENTEN ABSTINENCE AND FASTING UNTIL THE MIDNIGHT OF HOLY SATURDAY

10. The abstinence and fasting prescribed for Lent which, up until this time, according to Canon 1252, section 4, ceased after noon on Holy Saturday will in the future cease at midnight of the same Holy Saturday.

All things to the contrary notwithstanding.

November 16, 1955

GAETANO CARDINAL CICOGNANI,
Prefect, Sacred Congregation of Rites

✠ A. CARINCI, Archbishop of Seleucia,
Secretary, Sacred Congregation of Rites

INSTRUCTION

ON THE CORRECT USE OF THE RESTORED ORDO OF HOLY WEEK

Since it is the intention of the restored Ordo of Holy Week that, with the venerable liturgical services of these days restored to the hours that are proper and opportune, these liturgical services can be attended more easily, more devoutly, and more fruitfully by the faithful, it is highly important that this salutary purpose be realized.

Hence, it has seemed opportune to this Sacred Congregation of Rites to add to the general Decree on the restoration of the Ordo of Holy Week an Instruction, by which the change to the new order may be made easier and the faithful may be led more securely to derive richer fruits from a living participation in the sacred ceremonies.

The knowledge and the observance of this Instruction are obligatory for all of those whom it concerns.

I. ON THE PASTORAL AND RITUAL PREPARATION

1. Local Ordinaries should carefully see to it that priests, especially those who have the care of souls, should be well instructed not only about the ritual observance of the restored Ordo of Holy Week but also about its liturgical meaning and its pastoral purpose.

They should likewise take care that the faithful also during the holy season of Lent should be effectively taught properly to understand the restored Ordo of Holy Week so that they, mentally and spiritually, may take a devout part in the services.

2. The following are the main points of the Instruction that should be given the Christian people:

a) For the Second Sunday of Passiontide, which is called Palm Sunday.

The faithful are to be urged to assist in greater numbers at the solemn procession of the palms to give public testimony of their love and gratitude to Christ the King.

Moreover, the faithful should be admonished to approach the Sacrament of Penance in time during Holy Week. This admonition must be stressed especially in those places where it has been customary for the faithful to throng to Confession on Holy Saturday evening and Easter Sunday morning. Let those who have the responsibility for souls zealously see to it that the faithful have ready access to the sacrament of Penance during the whole of Holy Week and especially on the last three days of that week.

b) The Thursday of the Lord's Supper.

The faithful should be taught about the love by which Christ the Lord, "on the day before He suffered," instituted the Eucharist, a Sacrifice and Sacrament, and an everlasting memorial of His Passion to be renewed unceasingly through the hands of priests.

The faithful should be asked duly to adore the Blessed Sacrament, after the Mass of the Lord's Supper.

Where the washing of the feet, to show the Lord's commandment about fraternal charity, is performed in a Church according to

the rubrics of the restored Ordo of Holy Week, the faithful should be instructed on the profound meaning of this sacred rite and should be taught that it is only proper that they should abound in works of Christian charity on this day.

c) The Friday of the Lord's Passion and Death.

The faithful should be trained to gain a right understanding of the unique liturgical services of this day. In these services, after the sacred readings and prayers, the Passion of Our Lord is sung solemnly, prayers are offered for the needs of the entire Church and of the human race and the Holy Cross, the memorial of our redemption, is most devoutly adored by the Christian family, the clergy and the people. Finally, according to the rubrics of the restored Ordo, and as was the custom for many centuries, all who wish to do so and who are properly prepared can go to Holy Communion, so that, devoutly receiving the Lord's Body which was given for all on this day, they may receive richer fruits of the redemption.

The priests must emphasize the fact that on this most holy day the faithful should keep their minds piously recollected and should not forget the laws of abstinence and fasting.

d) For Holy Saturday and the Easter Vigil.

First of all, it is imperative that the faithful should be instructed about the unique liturgical character of Holy Saturday. This is the day of the most intense sorrow, the day on which the Church tarries at the Lord's tomb, meditating about His passion and death. While the altar remains stripped, the Church abstains from the sacrifice of the Mass until, after the solemn vigil or the nocturnal wait for the Resurrection, there come the Easter joys, the abundance of which carries over to the days that follow.

The intention and the purpose of this vigil is to point out and to recall in the liturgical service how our life and grace have flowed from the Lord's death. And so Our Lord himself is shown under the sign of the paschal candle as "the light of the World (*John* 8:12), who has put the darkness of our sins to flight by the grace of His light. The "Exultet" is sung, in which the splendor of the holy night of the Resurrection is glorified. The wonderful works done by God under the old alliance, pale imagings of the marvels

done under the new convenant, are recalled. There is the blessing of the baptismal water, in which "buried together with Christ" unto the death of sin, we rise again with the same Christ so that "we may walk in newness of life" (*Rom.* 6:4). Then we promise, by the renewal of our baptismal vows, to bear witness before all by our lives and our conduct to this grace which Christ has merited for us and which He confers upon us in Baptism. Finally, after we implore the intercession of the Church triumphant, the sacred vigil ends with the solemn Mass of the Resurrection.

3. The ritual preparation for the sacred ceremonies of Holy Week is no less necessary.

Hence all those things required for the devout and becoming performance of the liturgical services of Holy Week must be carefully prepared and put in order. The sacred ministers and all of the rest who take part in the services, whether clerics or laymen, especially the boys, should be thoroughly instructed about what they are to do.

II. ANNOTATIONS TO SOME RUBRICS OF THE ORDO OF HOLY WEEK

A. For the entire Holy Week

4. Where there are a sufficient number of sacred ministers the sacred services of Holy Week should be conducted with all the splendor of the sacred rites. Where there are not enough sacred ministers, the simple rite should be used. The special rubrics, as noted in the proper places, are to be observed.

5. Whenever in the restored Ordo of Holy Week, the words "as in the Roman Breviary" occur, everything is to be taken from this liturgical book. In such cases the norms set forth in the general Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites "On bringing back the rubrics into a simpler form," issued March 23, 1955, are to be observed.

6. During the entire Holy Week, that is from the second Sunday in Passiontide or Palm Sunday up to the Mass of the Easter vigil inclusive, in the Mass (and on Friday in the solemn liturgical service), whenever the function is solemn, that is, performed with sacred ministers, the celebrant is to omit whatever the deacon, the subdeacon, or the lector sing or read in the performance of their own part of the ceremony.

B. For the Second Sunday of Passiontide or Palm Sunday

7. In the blessing and the procession, palm or olive branches or the branches of other trees may be used. These branches may, in accordance with local custom, be prepared by the faithful themselves and brought by them into the church or they may be distributed to the faithful after they are blessed.

C. For the Thursday of the Lord's Supper

8. As is prescribed in the Roman Missal, a suitable place should be prepared in some chapel or at some altar of the church for the solemn Reposition of the Sacrament. This should as far as possible be ornamented becomingly with veils and lights.

9. A severity consonant with the liturgy of these days is clearly recommended and the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites about abuses which are to be avoided or removed are to be observed.

10. Parish priests and rectors of churches should warn the faithful in time about the public adoration of the Holy Eucharist. This is to be started once the Mass of the Lord's Supper has ended and is to be continued at least until midnight, when the memory of the Lord's passion and death takes the place of the liturgical recalling of the institution of the Holy Eucharist.

D. For the Easter Vigil

11. There is nothing to prevent the previous preparation, in colors or in some other way, of the marks to be incised with a knife on the paschal candle.

12. It is fitting that the candles held by the clergy and by the people should remain lighted while the "Exultet" is being sung and during the renewal of the baptismal vows.

13. The container for the water that is to be blessed should be decorated in a fitting manner.

14. If people who are to be baptized are present, especially if there should be many of them, it is permissible to transfer to a convenient time on the morning of the same day the ceremonies of the Roman Ritual that precede the actual administration of Baptism, namely, in the Baptism of infants up to the word "Credis" (*Rituale Romanum,* tit. III, cap. 11, n. 12) and in the Baptism

of adults up to the words "Quis vocaris?" (*Rituale Romanum*, tit. III, cap. IV, n. 38).

15. If it should happen that Holy Orders are also being conferred during this solemn vigil, the Pontiff this night should put the final admonition (with the imposition of the so-called "duty") which, according to the *Pontificale Romanum*, should come after the pontifical benediction and before the last gospel, before the pontifical benediction.

16. On the vigil of Pentecost the lessons or prophecies, the blessing of the baptismal water and the litanies are omitted. The Mass, even when this is the conventual Mass or a solemn or sung Mass, is begun in the usual manner, after the confession has been said at the altar steps. It begins from the Introit "Cum sanctificatus fueris" as is prescribed for private Masses in this same place in the Roman Missal.

III. ON THE MASS, HOLY COMMUNION, AND THE EUCHARISTIC FAST DURING THESE THREE DAYS

17. On the Thursday of the Lord's Supper there must be observed that very ancient tradition of the Roman Church, according to which, with the celebration of private Masses forbidden, all priests and clerics may assist at the Mass of the Lord's Supper and receive Holy Communion (cf. Can. 862).

However, where pastoral reasons so dictate, the Ordinary may permit one or two low Masses in individual Churches and public oratories. In semi-public oratories, however, there can be only one low Mass. This permission is given to give all the faithful the opportunity to assist at the sacrifice of the Mass and to receive the Lord's Body on this day. These Masses are permitted only during the hours assigned for the celebration of the solemn Mass of the Lord's Supper (Decree, n. II, 7).

18. On the Thursday of the Lord's Supper Holy Communion may be distributed to the faithful only during the evening Masses or immediately after them. Likewise on Holy Saturday it can be given only during Mass or immediately after it. The sick and those in danger of death are excepted from this rule.

19. On the Friday of the Lord's passion and death Holy Communion may be distributed only at the solemn liturgical services

in the afternoon, except to the sick and to those in danger of death.

20. Priests who celebrate the Mass of the Easter Vigil at the proper hour, that is, after midnight of the night between Saturday and Sunday, can also celebrate the Mass of the feast on Easter Sunday, and, if they have the indult, they may celebrate twice or three times.

21. Ordinaries who celebrate the Mass for the consecration of the chrism in the morning of the Thursday of the Lord's Supper can also celebrate the solemn Mass of the Lord's Supper the evening of that day. If they should wish to celebrate the solemn Easter Vigil on Holy Saturday, they may, but they are not obliged to, celebrate the solemn Mass on Easter Sunday itself.

22. With regard to the Eucharistic fast, the norms of the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus,* issued Jan. 6, 1955, are to be observed.

IV. ON THE SOLUTION OF CERTAIN DIFFICULTIES

23. Since there are in various places and among various peoples, many popular customs connected with the observance of Holy Week, local Ordinaries and priests having the care of souls should seek prudently to harmonize customs of this kind which appear to contribute to solid piety with the restored Ordo of Holy Week. The faithful, moreover, should be taught about the supreme value of the sacred liturgy which always, and particularly today, by its very nature far surpasses other kinds of devotions and customs, however good these may be.

24. Where it has been the custom up until now to bless homes on Holy Saturday, let the local Ordinaries give proper directions so that this blessing may be given at a more convenient time, either before or after Easter. The blessing should be given by parish priests, or by other priests having care of souls delegated by the parish priests, who thus may take advantage of this occasion paternally to visit the faithful entrusted to them and to take account of their spiritual condition (Can. 462, n. 6).

25. The ringing of the bells prescribed for the beginning of the hymn "Gloria in excelsis" at the solemn evening Mass of Holy Thursday and at the Mass of the vigil on Holy Saturday is to be done in this way:

a) In places where there is only one church, the bells should be rung when the singing of this hymn begins.

b) In places where there are many churches, regardless of whether the ceremonies take place at the same time in all of them or not, the bells of all the churches should be rung at the same time as those of the cathedral church, or the mother church, or the principal church. Should there be doubt as to which is the mother or the principal church, the Ordinary should be consulted.

November 16, 1955

GAETANO CARDINAL CICOGNANI,
Prefect, Sacred Congregation of Rites

✠ A. CARINCI, Archbishop of Seleucia,
Secretary, Sacred Congregation of Rites

EDITOR'S NOTE: *These documents are so important that most of our readers will want the original Latin texts for their libraries. We shall carry these Latin texts in the February issue of the* Review.

Book Reviews

THE PSALMS: FIDES TRANSLATION. Introduction and notes by Mary Perkins Ryan. Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1955. Pp. xxxvii+306. $3.95.

An attractive edition of the Psalms like the present work, due at least in large part to laymen, gives reason for optimism about the biblical and the liturgical movements in our country. Though intended "for the guidance of other laymen who have tried to pray the Psalms and found it difficult," the volume includes much that will repay study also by clerics. Priests who complain that they "get nothing out of the Breviary" will be surprised to find so much in the Breviary when they read Mrs. Ryan's introduction. Wisely, she passes over questions of authorship and titles briefly (the latter could have been easily omitted in both introduction and notes) in order to concentrate on more vital subjects like, "How can Christians pray the Psalms?" and "Keywords and Themes." The fifteen pages devoted to the latter are the best in the book; they show that the writer has assimilated the recent rich literature in French on the subject. When we learn just what "misericordia et fidelitas" or "gloria Domini," for example, meant to the Psalmists and how these ideas developed throughout the Old Testament, we pray better "with the understanding"; and when we see how the Incarnate Word transformed these concepts and filled them with the full revelation of the New Testament, so that they are living, up-to-date vehicles of our own prayer, whether communal or individual, we also pray better "with the spirit." Because this introduction is otherwise uniformly excellent, the confusion evidenced on pp. xix-xx in the explanation of *Yahweh* is the more jarring. The Jews did *not* make up a "substitute word, Jehovah," to use instead of Yahweh. When the Masoretes (c. 700-1000 A.D.) equipped the Hebrew text (written only with consonants as long as Hebrew was a living language and for centuries afterward) with vowel-points, they reminded the reader to respect the century-old custom of substituting *Adonai* (Lord) for *Yahweh* by inserting the vowel-points of *ădonai* into the consonants of *Y h w h,* never intending that the two should be pronounced together to produce the verbal monstrosity, *Jehovah.* That was a blunder on the part of Christians! Again, on p. xx, Mrs. Ryan credits the *legend* that the Septuagint "was done by *seventy* scholars."

Like the Benziger edition of 1945, the Fides Translation is anonymous. The translator(s) had no reason to feel ashamed of his (their) work, which aims (generally with success) not only at "individual reading" but also at "recitation aloud and . . . singing."

An occasional unidiomatic rendering is found, e.g., *Ps.* 121,1, "We go to the house of the Lord!" Unpardonable, especially since the translation purports to reproduce the new *Psalterium Pianum,* which has the future tense. Similarly, why "sacrifices of justice" (4,6; 50,21), "edicts of your justice" (118,106, 164), when *Pianum* has respectively, *sacrificia iusta, sacrificia legitima, iusta decreta, iusta iudicia?* What does the ordinary reader get out of expressions like, "God of justice" "gates of justice"? The basic terms "just" and "justice" should have been explained among the "Key-words." Their rich and varied content often defies translation by a single equivalent. Several other renderings I could not justify, either as translations of *Pianum,* or by recourse to the original Hebrew: Luke 1,54, "raised up" for *suscepit;* Ps. 2,11. "by the wayside," *de via;* 7,9, "that I am in the right . . .", *secundum iustitiam;* 7,12, "giving sentence," *comminans;* 41,3, "God of my life," *Deum vivum;* 47,3, "Mount Sion in the far north," *Mons Sion, aquilo extremus* (the footnote gives the correct interpretation, at variance with the translation!); 67,9.22, "melted . . . suddenly," *stillarunt . . . profecto;* 138,21, "should I not hate?" *odio habeo.*

EDWARD F. SIEGMAN, C.PP.S.

JOHN CARROLL OF BALTIMORE, FOUNDER OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY. By Annabelle M. Melville. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955. Pp. ix+338. $4.50.

Four years after his ordination in 1769, Father John Carroll, S.J., was profoundly shocked by the papal suppression of the Society of Jesus. It was an event which he had foreseen, but which he had hoped and prayed might in some way be averted. At the moment it appeared to him that "immediate death" would have been God's "greatest blessing." Father Carroll decided to return immediately to his native Maryland.

By coming home Carroll himself said that he had "sacrificed the best place in England." But his decision had vast consequences for the Church in the United States. The interesting story of his priestly life during the formative years of this country, and later, as Bishop and Archbishop of Baltimore during the critical years, is told by Annabelle M. Melville in this freshly written and scholarly biography of the founding bishop of the American hierarchy.

Hardly had Carroll returned to America than he took his undisputed place as the outstanding Catholic clergyman in the colonies. As soon as the chaotic years of the Revolution had passed it was Carroll who inspired the historical meeting of his fellow-priests at Whitemarsh in June, 1783. With independence achieved, he realized more clearly than others that the Church in this new Republic must be severed from all suspicion of secular foreign control. Not unexpectedly, Father Carroll was the choice of his fellow-priests as superior of the Church here, and on June 9, 1784, he was officially confirmed as head of missions in the provinces of the new Republic of the United States. He was forty-nine years old and in the prime of life.

Five years later the American priests met again at Whitemarsh, this time to designate their choice for the first bishop of the new Republic. By a vote of twenty-four to two their lot fell to Carroll, and on Sept. 14, 1789, Pope Pius VI confirmed their choice by appointing Father Carroll the first Bishop of Baltimore. It was, we know now, a most wise nomination. No ecclesiastic approaches Carroll in the measure of influence he exerted on the rapidly expanding Church in the United States.

From the day of his consecration, Aug. 15, 1790, until that of his death, Dec. 3, 1815, Bishop Carroll strove ceaselessly to guide and govern his vast diocese with prudence and wisdom. Innumerable were the problems which begged for solution. So much is this true that the narrative often loses sight of the positive side of his episcopacy and of the constructive development of the Church in the United States. Attention from the latter is many times averted by the spectacular flare-up of strife within the ranks of the faithful. A major portion of the book is devoted to Carroll's preoccupation with problems caused by the advent of undisciplined clerics from abroad seeking service in this country, by the divisive efforts of nationalistic factions in some churches, by the specter of trustee-controlled churches, by the urgent need of caring for the numerous immigrants, by the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory and the opening up of the old Northwest, and many others.

From this biography there emerges Carroll, the priest, bishop, and archbishop, who was first of all a dedicated and exemplary ecclesiastic and secondly a patriotic and devoted citizen of his beloved country. If a general defect may be pointed out, it is this: Mrs. Melville too often appears as the advocate of the defense. Lacking is that obvious display of impartiality which so commonly finds acceptance as the hall-mark of the professional historian. This is hardly a fault in an author so thoroughly informed, and Mrs. Melville has contributed a very valuable volume to the growing list of commendable books deal-

ing with the history of the Church in this country. True, her volume will not displace Monsignor Guilday's earlier and more detailed life of Carroll. This was not the intention of the author. For the average Catholic layman, and it might be hoped non-Catholic too, interested in reading about the Church, this is by far a handier and more readable book. It merits a place on the easy-to-reach shelf of every priest's library.

CARROLL J. NOONAN, S.S.

THE SCHOLAR AND THE CROSS: THE LIFE AND WORK OF EDITH STEIN. By Hilda C. Graef. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1955. Pp. viii+234. $3.50.

The name of Edith Stein is becoming ever more familiar to the readers of current Catholic literature. Recently there has been a sharp increase in the number of articles that tell the story of this modern woman whose life covered so wide a gamut—Jew, atheist, eminent philosopher, convert, lay apostle, Carmelite nun, and finally martyr to Nazi oppression. And now in Hilda Graef's book the Newman Press publishes the second full-length work in English concerning Edith Stein. The translation of Teresia Renata's popular German life was the first (Sheed and Ward, 1952).

This attention shown to Edith Stein is well deserved for there is inspiration to be found in her life and wisdom in her writings. Hilda Graef's study is especially interesting in that it is not mere biography. It goes further and introduces the reader to Edith Stein's writings, which among other things are concerned with philosophy, mystical theology, education, and the psychology of woman and her place in modern life.

Miss Graef is by her background particularly fitted to write this book. Like Edith Stein she is German with Jewish heritage. She is also a convert and a keen scholar whose pen is enriching the field of Catholic literature. Certainly this present work on Edith Stein is no cursory investigation. Its analysis is penetrating, and no conclusion is the result of hasty or superficial thought. Miss Graef does not hesitate to point out instances in the writings of Edith Stein that she considers to have flaws. Most of the book is quick and easy reading; all of it is definitely rewarding.

Priests can make use of the material in this book to present Edith Stein as a model for modern women whether it be for women engaged in higher studies, or for those interested in the lay or liturgical

apostolate, or finally for those women who, like Edith Stein, have given up all to become *Sponsae Christi.*

KEITH J. EGAN, O.CARM.

PATRISTIC HOMILIES ON THE GOSPELS. Translated and edited by M. F. Toal. Vol. I. Chicago: The Henry Regnery Company, 1955. Pp. 503. $7.50.

The first volume of *Patristic Homilies On The Gospels,* just to hand, translated and edited by Father Toal, and published by the Mercier Press of Cork, will be a most valuable book for the library of every pastor: whose chief duty is the preaching of the Gospel. In the Encyclical Letter of Aug. 12, 1950, His Holiness Pope Pius XII has enjoined on those whose task is to teach the divine truths that "they must ever recur to the sources—the *fontes*—which form the deposit of the Faith, which are the Scriptures, and Sacred Tradition as taught by the Fathers and Doctors of the Church." For the busy pastor occupied with the weekly cares of his parish, it would be difficult to find the time to read and translate the sermons of the Latin and Greek Fathers, and find there material for Sunday and Feastday sermons to help him to fulfill this first duty as a pastor: that of preaching the Gospel. And he might indeed also be dismayed by reason of the difficulty of the selections we meet daily in the third nocturns. But the result is that the wisdom of the Gregorys, of the Basils, of Leo, Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Bede and the whole great treasury of the Fathers is neglected, and their gems of thought never collected and used in preaching.

Father Toal's work has simplified all this and placed the teaching of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church on the Gospels of each Sunday of the year, and on countless moral themes, at the disposal of all in a very simple, precise and dignified manner. He has, to quote the Foreword written by one of our greatest present-day theological authorities, "put into the hands of his fellow priests material of incomparable value, in a form easy of access, with a view to aiding them in the sacred ministry of preaching."

Father Toal's first volume deals with the Gospels from the First Sunday of Advent to Quinquagesima, inclusive. It is divided into eighteen Sections, one for each Sunday and greater Feast. At the head of each Section is the Gospel, then follow the parallel gospels where they occur; next follows a word for word exposition of the Gospel of the Sunday taken from the *Catena aurea* of St. Thomas Aquinas. Then follows a selection of from four to eight homilies from the different

Fathers. In all, there are seventy-nine homilies: for the most part they are, though given completely, surprisingly brief, an average of little over two pages. Excepting some of Chrysostom's and Augustine's, all here presented are now appearing for the first time in an English dress: and this is also true of the *Catena aurea,* which the author later proposes to publish in a complete version.

The *Catena aurea* is possibly the least known of the Saint's work. The author in his Preface describes it as "a miracle of wisdom and knowledge," in which the Angelic Doctor has "woven into a golden chain of witness and sacred wisdom the teaching of the Fathers and Doctors on each successive word of the Gospel." These citations are in themselves very inspiring, and would provide endless themes for special sermons. E.g. a random selection from the first Section: Eusebius on the Gospel of the First Sunday of Advent: "When the Son of God is about to appear in glory, to cast down the now ended tyranny of the son of sin, the gates of heaven, closed from all ages, will now by the hands of ministering angels be thrown wide open, so that the heavens stand revealed." And commenting on the same Gospel, Ambrose says: "So oppressive therefore will be the unrest of souls, that unhappily conscious of the multitude of our offenses, and fearful of the judgment to come, the very dew of baptism shall dry upon our brow." Of His Coming, Ambrose goes on to add: "His Coming is also longed for, so that by His Presence there may be accomplished in the whole world of angels and of men, that which is wrought in single souls who with all fitting dispositions receive Christ."

In this first Section there are five homilies, from St. Ambrose, St. Ephraem, St. Leo the Great, St. Gregory the Great, and St. Bernard. It closes with a wonderful apostrophe by St. Bernard to Our Lady, at the close of his sermon on The Advent of the Lord and Its Six Circumstances: "Let thy boundless charity cover the multitude of our sins, and they glorious fruitfulness bring us an abundance of mercies. Our Lady, Our Mediatrix, present us to Thy Son. Speak for us to Thy Son. Grant, O Most Blessed, through the graces thou hast earned, through the privileges thou hast merited, through the mercy thou hast received, that He Who deigned by means of Thee to become a Sharer of our infirmity and sorrow, may through thy intercession make us sharers of His Glory and of His Joy."

A final quotation, from the sublime but difficult Leo: a test piece; his exhortation to the new-made Christians, and his exposition of that dignity which is now theirs:

Awake, O Man, from sleep, and recognise the dignity of your nature. Remember that thou art made in the image and likeness of God; which

though corrupted in Adam, was made new in Christ. Use visible things as they must be used, as you use the earth, the sky, the sea, the air, springs and rivers; and whatever there is in them that is beautiful and wondrous, offer to the praise and glory of the Creator. For we are the temple of God, and if the Spirit of God doth dwell in us, greater far is that which each faithful has in his own soul, than he beholds in the heavens. Most dearly Beloved, we are not therefore declaring to you, or advising you, that you look down upon the works of God, or that you should see something contrary to your faith in those things which the Good God has made good: but only that you use every kind of creature, and all the beauty of this visible world with reason and moderation; *for the things that are seen are temporal; but the things that are not seen are eternal.*

Every person having the care of souls will find in these homilies the most inspiring thoughts, expressed in simple language, which would be a source of comfort to the hearers of the Word and a profound help in their personal sanctification: for such regular and daily contact with the Fathers and Teachers of the Church must produce good fruit.

A Foreword to this volume has been written by the Most Reverend Father Michael Browne, O.P., former Rector Magnificus of the Angelicum University, later spiritual Theologian to His Holiness, and now Master-General of the Dominican Order. In this Foreword he says: "Father Toal has placed in the easiest possible reach of the busy priest this treasure house of sacred lore, this quintessence of the doctrine of Tradition on each Gospel." And every student of Father Browne the English-speaking world over knows the value of the Master-General's words.

A special word of praise is due to the publishers for their very commendable work; their craftsmen have really produced a work of unusual excellence which can compare well with that of many older firms as regards paper, binding, print and lay-out, and general appearance.

HUGH O'FLAHERTY

FUNDAMENTALS OF CATHOLIC DOGMA. By Dr. Ludwig Ott. Translated from the German by Patrick Lynch. Edited in English by James Canon Bastible. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1954. Pp. 519. $7.50.

The publication of this volume by Dr. Ott should bolster the argumentation of those who protest the use of the "digest" approach to the study of Sacred Theology. Dr. Ott has attempted to compress the entire field of Dogmatic Theology (including Fundamental, Special,

and Sacramental Dogma) into a single volume of 519 pages. The editor of the English edition calls this book, "the most remarkable work of compression of its kind that I have encountered." This may well be; but for all its remarkable qualities, it is not without serious defect. In the process of condensation, great care must be taken to avoid all distortion. The formidable task of a work of this sort is to effect not only brevity but also clarity. Dr. Ott has had remarkable success in attaining the first; he has experienced something less than success in his quest for the second.

Very often, in the scientific exposition of the Dogmas of the Church, conciseness can be attained only at the expense of clarity and accuracy. This has been the case in several sections of Dr. Ott's book and this despite the obvious scholarship which he brings to this work. In no place does his exposition of dogma suffer so much from the process of compression as in the treatment of the axiom, "extra Ecclesiam nulla salus."

Dr. Ott's explanation of this Dogma is beclouded considerably from the outset by his statement of the thesis. He gives it as follows: "Membership of the Church is necessary for all men for salvation." Again he says, speaking of the early days of the Church, "in view of the stress laid upon the necessity of membership of the Church for salvation, it is understandable that the possibility of salvation for those outside the Church is mentioned only hesitantly" (pp. 310, 311). At the very least this wording is confusing. It is, in fact, a distortion of the Catholic teaching. For the statements of the *magisterium* insist upon the *absolute* necessity of the *Church,* and not the necessity of membership of the Church. Furthermore, to say "it is understandable that the possibility of salvation for those outside the Church is mentioned only hesitantly" is to throw doubt upon the essential point of the dogma; for outside the Church no one at all is saved ("extra quam nullus omnino salvatur," IV Council of the Lateran). However, Dr. Ott has chosen to explain the dogma in terms of a *hypothetical* necessity of *membership* in the Church. This is evident from his explanation of the word "necessary":

"The necessity for belonging to the Church is not merely a necessity of precept (necessitas praecepti), but also a necessity of means (nec. medii), as the comparasion with the Ark, the means of salvation from the biblical flood, plainly shows. The necessity of means is, however, not an absolute necessity, but a hypothetical one. In special circumstances, namely, in the case of invincible ignorance or of incapability, actual membership of the Church can be replaced by the desire (votum) for the same. This need not be expressly (explicite) present, but can also be included in the moral readiness faithfully to fulfill the will of

God (votum implicitum). In this manner also those who are in point of fact outside the Catholic Church can achieve salvation" (p. 310).

We can find no reference in the statements of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* to a necessity of membership in the true Church. The Council of Florence asserts that those "intra catholicam Ecclesiam non exsistentes" will go into eternal fire, "nisi ante finem vitae eidem [Ecclesiae] fuerint aggregati." So also the *Unam Sanctam* of Pope Boniface VIII and the *Humani Generis* refer to the necessity of the *Church.* So also does the *Suprema haec sacra,* which, however, was not available to Dr. Ott since his foreword indicated that the German edition dates from August of 1952.

Finally, Dr. Ott holds that those who are in "special circumstances" are saved by a desire for membership in the Church. We cannot but conclude from this that there is, in fact, some sort of membership of desire which is in some way of a different kind and distinct from membership *in re.* Such an explanation can hardly be harmonized with the statement of Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis:* "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed." The concept of a "member in desire" is extremely confusing terminology; especially in a matter where the *magisterium* has so consistently emphasized the absolute necessity of the Church itself. Nowhere is there any reference to a necessity of membership in the Church.

Dr. Ott's concluding statement in the above quotation can hardly be termed as other than misleading. Presumably "those who are in point of fact outside the Catholic Church" refers to those who lack membership in the Church. If so, Dr. Ott should say so. It is one thing to be outside the Church and quite another to be without membership in the Church. One who is outside the Church cannot attain salvation. One who is not a member of the Church can, in certain circumstances, attain salvation.

Another section where clarity has been replaced by conciseness is in the treatment of the so-called *Comma Johanneum.* In regard to the reply of the Holy Office concerning *I John* 5:7, Dr. Ott says: "Even if the passage be not a genuine constituent part of the Vulgate, it is nevertheless authentic that is, free from error dogmatically. In the year 1897 the Congregation of the Inquisition declared that the genuineness of the passage could not with certainty be denied or doubted. As in later times the spuriousness was more and more clearly shown, the Holy Office, in 1927, declared that after careful examination of the whole circumstances, the genuineness could be denied. D. 2198" (p. 56).